



## TO THE READER

**K**INDLY use this book very carefully. If the book is disfigured or marked or written on while in your possession the book will have to be replaced by a new copy or paid for. In case the book be a volume of set of which single volumes are not available the price of the whole set will be realized.

AMARSINGH COLLEGE



Checked  
1976

**Library**

Class No. 954.001

Book No. B 32 e

Acc. No. 138



98  
Com-ES  
AL-42-41

THE  
COLONIZATION OF INDIA  
BY EUROPEANS

BY  
MAJOR B. D. BASU, I.M.S, (Retd.)

PUBLISHED BY  
R. CHATTERJEE, M.A.,  
91, Upper Circular Road,  
CALCUTTA.

Price Rs 2.

LIBRARY, 5708

A. S. College

954.081

532 C

acc no 138

Printed by A. C. Sarkar, at the Prabasi Press,  
91, Upper Circular Road, Calcutta.

## PREFACE

Most of the publications on which the present work is based are not easily accessible to the reading public of the country. They have gone out of print and become scarce and rare. Hence extracts *in extenso* have been reproduced from them for ready reference. This work originally appeared in the shape of serial articles in the *Modern Review* from which they are reproduced with additions and alterations.

B. D. BASU.



## CONTENTS

### CHAPTER I

	PAGE
The genesis of the British idea of civilising India ...	1
The policy of the British in India being the effect of the blockade against English goods by Napoleon ...	3
How England grew rich at the expense of India ...	5
The behaviour and the temperament of the English made them unpopular in India ...	10
Why the East India Company prevented the English from settling in India ...	12
Natives of England jealous of the monopoly of the Company ...	17
The pleas put forth to supplant the rule of the Company ...	18
The views of Warren Hastings and Sir John Malcolm ...	20
And of Mr. Charles Grant against influx of the British ...	21
The lust for gold of the Britishers outweighed every other consideration ...	24
Their desire was to crush Indian industries, to promote their trade and to settle in India ...	30

### CHAPTER II.

The free influx of Englishmen into India ...	31
Under the pretext of civilising India Britishers wished to freely trade and live in the country ...	31
Many Anglo-Indians were against the free influx of the natives of England in India—their statements ...	32-43
How an European population in India was regarded as beneficial to England ...	44-46
Evils of European influx ...	49
Difficulties in getting justice against Europeans ...	51-52
The policy was to displace Indians by Britishers ...	56



## CHAPTER III.

	PAGE.
The settlement of Europeans in India ...	60
"Give them an inch and they will ask for an ell" —its applicability to the British ...	60
Metcalfe and Bentinck favour European settlement from political considerations ...	64
The views of Metcalfe and Bentinck disproved by several eminent Englishmen ...	65-70
Settlement of Europeans detrimental to India ...	76
Opinion of Mr. Elphinstone ...	78
The number of British Settlers in India ...	81
Practically Europeans were allowed to settle un- hindered inspite of the rules and regulations to the contrary ...	85
Misconduct of indigo planters unheeded ...	86
Military aspect of settlement of Europeans con- sidered ...	90
Settlement of Europeans encouraged ...	94
The removal of the license, its bad effects ...	95

## CHAPTER IV.

The Parliamentary Committee in 1858 on the Colonization of India ...	97
Ill effects of the Colonization ...	100
Marquis Cornwallis against it ...	101
Colonization advocated under mark of philan- thropy ...	102
Shore, Metcalfe and Bentinck in favour of it ...	104-5
Colonization loudly demanded by the people of England ...	108
How India was regarded as the safety valve of the British people ...	110
The effect of the Mutiny on the idea of Coloniza- tion ...	114
The greatest obstacle to Colonization is mutual antipathy between the two races ...	117
Parliamentary Committee's report is against the Colonization ...	121
European tea planters were benefited at the expense of Indians ...	123
Railways made to help British capitalists ...	126
It was suggested that Englishmen should be appointed to all important posts ...	132

	PAGE
The in-efficiency of the covenanted English Civilians shown ...	136
The transfer of Government from Company to Crown favourable to Colonization, and ...	139
Settlement of the British in India ...	140

#### CHAPTER V.

The possibility of the Colonization of India by the Britishers ...	142
The obstacles to Colonization ...	142
Real reasons for slow Colonization ...	134
The disabilities of tropical Colonizations ...	146
The advantages of Colonising Kashmir enumerated	147-8

---

## ERRATA

Page	3	line	8 from bottom	for 'had' read 'has'
"	23	"	18	for 'may' read 'May'
"	91	"	4	Add 'says' after 'Mayne'
"	106	"	16	for 'there,' read 'their'
"	110	"	13 from bottom,	omit 'of' between 'Educated'
				and 'masses.'
"	112	"	12	'insouciance' to be in italics.
"	"	"	17	for 'turient' read 'parturient'
"	"	"	19	for 'lasted' read 'lashed'
"	136	"	15	for 'Convenanted' read 'Covenanted'
"	143	"	13 from bottom	for 'Mrs.' read 'Mr.'

# THE Colonization of India by Europeans

## CHAPTER I

### THE GENESIS OF THE BRITISH IDEA OF CIVILISING INDIA

With the opening of the nineteenth century, events were occurring in Europe which had no inconsiderable share in shaping the course of the history of both England and India. After the French Revolution, a man, who has left the indelible mark of genius on the pages of the history of not only France but of the whole of Europe, rose like a giant, and to crush him was the great object of the statesmen and people of England. The Corsican adventurer, Napoleon Bonaparte, was a terror to the English and like an incubus was disturbing the even tenor of their existence. He called the English a nation of shopkeepers, and as that nation destroyed his fleet, he took steps to destroy their commerce, on which their prosperity depended. He said he would conquer sea by land. He blockaded all the ports of the continent of Europe against the importation of British

goods and manufactures. The economic effect of this blockade was very keenly felt by the English. England had lost America, and the other colonies which she still possessed were not in a sufficiently flourishing condition to increase the wealth of England by becoming her customers. England planted her colonies with the object of enriching herself at their expense. Adam Smith in his "Wealth of Nations" writes:—

"To found a great empire for the sole purpose of raising up a people of customers, may at first sight appear a project fit only for a nation of shopkeepers..... The maintenance of this monopoly has hitherto been the principal, or more properly perhaps the sole end and purpose of the dominion which Great Britain assumes over her colonies. In the exclusive trade, it is supposed, consists the great advantage of provinces which have never yet afforded either revenue or military force for the support of the civil government or defence of the mother country. The monopoly is the principal badge of their dependency, and it is the sole fruit which has hitherto been gathered from that dependency. Whatever expense Great Britain has laid out in maintaining this dependency, has really been laid out in order to support this monopoly."\*

But because the colonies could not enrich England, she turned her attention to India. It is said that Earl Mornington (afterwards known as

---

\* Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, Chapter VII, Part III.)

Marquess Wellesley) on the eve of his departure from England to assume the appointment of the Governor-General of India, received instructions from the Prime Minister Pitt to found an empire in India to compensate for the loss of America. That perhaps accounts for all the unprovoked wars he waged against Indian princes and the torrents of blood he shed of the Indian people. Be that as it may, the empire which England was building in India, without spending a single farthing out of the pocket of any of her inhabitants, was the means of saving her from the perilous position in which she had been placed by Napoleon.

The ports of the continent had been blockaded against English goods and manufactures and so the English took advantage of their political power in India to flood this country with English goods. But India was already an industrial and manufacturing country. In order to create a market for British manufactures, Indian industries had to be crushed. England felt no hesitation in doing in India what she had already done a century previously in Ireland. An Irish historian had narrated :

"The gross impolicy as well as the gross injustice of the commercial disabilities by which almost every form of Irish industry was deliberately and selfishly crushed. The history of those laws is well worthy of the attention of all who would study the social condition of Ireland, and it has been written by Mr. Froude with consummate power. Until the time of Charles I, Ireland



was placed commercially on all points on a level with England, but Wentworth, imagining that the Irish woollen manufactures might undersell those of England, took some measures to discourage them. This proceeding appears to have been purely arbitrary,.....With Charles II, .....legislative prohibitions began. Ireland was a great pasture country, and her chief source of wealth was the importation of her cattle into England. The English landowners complained of the rivalry and the importation of Irish cattle to England, as well as of salt, beef, bacon, butter and cheese, was absolutely prohibited. By her omission from the amended Navigation Act of 1663, Ireland was at the same time excluded from all direct trade with the British Colonies. Her two chief sources of wealth were thus utterly and wilfully annihilated. One chance, however, still remained. The Irish, when forbidden to export their cattle, turned their land into sheepwalks, and it soon appeared that, in spite of the poverty of the people and the low condition of civilization, a great and flourishing woollen trade was likely to arise. Ireland possessed the advantages of unlimited water-power, of cheap labour, and living, and, above all of the best wool in Europe. Many English and even foreign manufacturers went over, and in the first years that followed the revolution there was every probability of her becoming a considerable industrial nation. Once more the selfish policy of English manufacturers prevailed. The export of unmanufactured wool to foreign countries had been already forbidden. The legislature now interposed and forbade the export of Irish manufactured wool not only to England and the English dominions, but to every other country. The rising industry was thus completely annihilated.....Whole districts were thrown into a condition of poverty verging upon starvation,.....

The above lengthy extract from Lecky is meant to show the peculiar traits of the English character. The Irish are their neighbours and related to them by blood and religion. If they had no scruples to crush their industries and reduce them to poverty, what consideration could the English have for the natives of India, who were alien to them by religion, language, and above all, color ? So they set to work to destroy Indian industries and replace Indian manufactures by those of England and thus create a market in India for British goods. India suffered for the Napoleonic wars in Europe. England grew rich at the expense of India and was enabled to fight Napoleon with resources wrung out of India. The importance of India at this crisis to England has been fully appreciated by so competent a writer as Sir George Birdwood, who, in his introduction to the *First Letter Book of the East India Company*, 1600-1619, states that it was the Company's possession of India which enabled England, at the commencement of the nineteenth century, to successfully resist the machinations of Napoleon I, and he declares that

"the continued possession of India will be our chief stay in sustaining the manufacturing and mercantile preponderance in this country in the crushing commercial competition with which we have now everywhere to contend." }



The natives of England never spent a single farthing for the acquisition of India. But then they resented the East India Company enjoying the close preserve of India. The English were thirsting to have a finger in the Company's Indian pie. Even "the darkest cloud has its silver lining." So the East India Company with all its faults had one redeeming feature which should not be overlooked.

The Company was an exclusive body, and it did not allow any Europeans except those who were connected with it to settle in India for any purpose whatever. It did not encourage the colonisation and settlement of India by Englishmen for reasons which will be presently mentioned. Nay, the Company even went the length of propagating a myth that not more than three generations of pure-blooded Europeans could live in India, and there is no evidence for the statement so often made that a colony of Englishmen in India not at any time intermarrying with natives would disappear within a couple of centuries. The Company did all that lay in its power to prevent Europeans travelling about freely in this country. Thus an order was passed by the Governor-General that after 1st March, 1788,

"No persons in the civil or military service of the Company shall be allowed to proceed from the Company's provinces beyond Buxar without the Governor-General's

pass, to be produced to the Commanding Officer of that post, unless such persons are under orders, which shall appear either in the gazette (or by an official signature), to proceed to stations beyond that place, or unless they should be returning to their stations after the expiration of leave of absence. The same orders respect Europeans in general, who are not in the service of the Company."

According to the regulation passed by the Governor-General in Council on the 1st, May, 1793,

"No British subjects (excepting King's Officers, serving under the Presidency of Fort William, the Civil Covenanted Servants of the Company, and their Military Officers) shall be permitted to reside at a greater distance from Calcutta than ten miles, unless they enter into a bond rendering themselves amenable to the court of Dewany Adawlut, within the jurisdiction of which they may reside, in all civil suits that may be instituted against them by natives or inhabitants of either of the provinces of Bengal, Behar or Orissa, coming within the descriptions of persons declared amenable to the Zillah and City Courts, for any sum of money or thing, the amount or value of which shall not exceed five hundred sicca rupees, and that this bond is to be executed in open court before the Judge of the Court within the jurisdiction of which such British subject may reside or take up his abode."

In letters, dated the 11th December, 1793, and the 28th may, 1794, the Court of Directors ordered that new covenants should be taken from every person in their service. They wrote:—

"We direct that every person in our service be called upon immediately to execute the covenants proper to his station, and that on his refusing to do so, he be dismissed

and have notice to come home. We also direct that all other British subjects, residing under your presidency, whether with or without license, be forthwith called upon to execute the covenants proper to their stations, and that on neglect or refusal to execute they have notice to quit India, as we are determined not to permit any persons in future to reside in India, without our license and being under proper covenants, so that any irregularity of conduct may be more readily corrected. With regard to persons who reside under your presidency, and have not entered into covenants of any description, we have sent a number of covenants of the denomination of covenants of *free merchants, free mariners and of persons permitted to reside in India*; these are calculated to suit all persons, who are to reside under the Company's protection and you will take care that each person executes one of these descriptions in the mode already pointed out."

"Those known as *free merchants*" were obliged to furnish two responsible persons in England to enter into security in the sum of £2,000."

The following were the instructions for the marine authorities for the landing of new comers in India:—

"The Commanders of all foreign vessels importing at Calcutta, are required to deliver into the Master Attendant's Office, on their arrival, the names of the commanders, officers, crews and passengers on board the said vessels, and that the Master Attendant is positively prohibited from furnishing any foreign vessels importing at Calcutta, with pilot until such list shall have been delivered to him."

The East India Company had to issue all these

orders, because they knew that they never conquered India by their sword, but held it by the sufferance of the people. Therefore, the Company took all precautions necessary not to wound the feelings of the natives of India in any way. It was on this ground that Christian Missionaries were not allowed to settle in territories then under the administration of the Company. Carey and others had to settle in Serampore, which was owned at that time by the Danes.

The East India Company knowing full well the temperament and moral nature of their compatriots and co-religionists made all those regulations which discouraged Englishmen coming out in large numbers to India. For had they at that time allowed Englishmen to come out and settle in India, they would not have succeeded in consolidating their power in this country. It is impossible for Englishmen to ingratiate themselves with natives of foreign countries. Mr. Meredith Townsend in his 'Asia and Europe,' (p. 216) says that an Englishman is hated everywhere.

"It is very difficult, of course, for an Englishman, conscious of his own rectitude of purpose and benevolence of feeling, to believe that he will not be more liked when he is better known; but a good many facts seem to show that it is so. He is not seen and talked to anywhere by men of a different race so much as he is in Ireland, and he is not hated quite so much anywhere else. He is decidedly much more disliked in Egypt since he appeared

there in such numbers. He is more hated in the seacoast towns of India, where he is prominent, busy and constantly talked to, than he is in the interior where he is rarely seen; much more detested in the planter districts than in the districts where he is only a rare visitor. If there is contempt for him anywhere in India, it is in the great towns, not in the rural stations where he is so nearly invisible; and contempt is of all forms of race-hatred the most dangerous."

In India, even in those days, when the English did not possess any political power, they behaved towards the natives of this country in a manner which did not enhance their reputation for honesty or fair dealing. The author of the *English in Western India*, Rev. Philip Anderson, writes (p. 32):—

"As the number of adventurers increased, the reputation of the English was not improved. Too many committed deeds of violence and dishonesty. We can shew that even the Commanders of vessels belonging to the Company did not hesitate to perpetrate robberies on the high seas or on shore when they stood in no fear of retaliation. During a visit which some English ships paid to Dabhol the officers suddenly started up from a conference with the native chiefs, and attacked the town, having first secured some large guns in such a manner that they could not be turned against them. Their attempt failed, but after retreating to their ships they succeeded in making prizes of two native boats. Della Valle declares that it was customary for the English to commit such outrages.

"And although this last account may be suspected as



dictated by the prejudices of an Italian, we can see no reason to question Sir Thomas Herbert's veracity. Sailing along the coasts with several vessels under the command of an English Admiral, he descried, when off Mangalore, a heavily laden craft after which a Malabar pirate was skulking. The native merchant in his fright sought refuge with the Admiral, but, writes our author with confessed grief, his condition was little better than it would have been, if he had fallen into the pirate's hands. After a short consultation, his ship was adjudged a prize by the English officers. 'For my part,' proceeds Herbert, 'I could not reach the offence, but this I could, that she had a cargo of cotton, opium, onions, and probably somewhat under the cotton of most value, which was her crime it seems. But how the prize was distributed concerns not me to inquire; I was a passenger, but no merchant, nor informer. The whole account would be incredible if not given on such good authority; but as it is, we must regard it as a blot upon the English character, and some justification of the Moghul officers when they afterwards brought charges of piracy against the Company's servants. Sixty of the native seamen, concluding from the churlish conduct of the English that mischief was intended, and that they would be sold as slaves to the people of Java, trusted rather to the mercy of the waves than of such Englishmen, and threw themselves into the sea, which seemed sport to some there,' writes Herbert, 'but not so to me, who had compassion,' some were picked up by canoes from the shore, and some by English boats; but the latter were so enraged with the treatment which they had received, that they again endeavoured to drown themselves. A terrible storm which followed was regarded by the narrator as a token of God's severe displeasure.

"Such were the English at their first appearance on

the western coast of India.....But doubtless at first the popular feeling was one of fear, afterwards of contempt. Hindus and Mussalmans considered the English a set of cow-eaters and fire-drinkers, vile brutes, fiercer than the mastiffs which they brought with them, who would fight like Eblis, cheat their own fathers and exchange with the same readiness a broadside of shot and thrusts of boarding pikes, or a bale of goods and a bag of rupees.

"As time wore on, the estimation in which the English had been held, declined.....These English were indeed regarded as men of an insignificant country, dissolute morals, and a degraded religion."

Little wonder, then, that the East India Company from motives of self-interest, and instinct of self-preservation, prevented the English from settling in India. The same considerations also prevented them from disseminating the spread of Christianity in this country. Christianity might be a religion of love, but it did not appear so to the natives of India. (Sir Phillip Francis, a zealous Christian himself, for he was the son of a Christian minister and was brought up on the teachings of the Bible from his very cradle, thus spoke regarding the failure of Christianity in India:—

"Listen to the poor Brahmin, when the New Testament was explained to him. 'Your religion may be very good for *you* and *your* climate, and your lawgiver seems to have been a wise man, for he says, *judge of the tree by the fruits*. To us that fruit has been bitter, but you

must make a desert of India before you can plant the tree in our land.”\*)

The author of “The English in Western India” thus refers to the estimate which natives of India had formed of Christianity.

“But according to Terry, the natives had formed a mean estimate of Christianity. It was not uncommon to hear them at Surat giving utterance to such remarks as:—“Christian religion, devil religion; Christian much drunk, Christian much do wrong, much beat, much abuse others.” Terry admitted that the natives themselves were very square, and exact to make good all their engagements; but if a dealer was offered much less for his articles than the price which he had named, he would be apt to say:—‘What! dost thou think me a Christian, that I would go about to deceive thee?’

“There was at least one European also who had no higher opinion than natives of Englishmen’s religion, as will appear from the following anecdote. When Terry was in Surat a certain Spaniard presented himself at the factory, and asked for employment. He gave out that he was by birth an Hidalgo, which as our author explains, ‘signifies in Spanish the son of some body,’.....

“This strange character gave his name as ‘the Knight of the Golden Rapier,’ and declared that having come with the Spanish Viceroy to Goa, he had, in defence of his spotless honor fought so many duels there, that he had been placed in confinement, and required by the priests to atone with penances for the indulgence of his sanguinary propensities.....Such was the story of this

---

\* Memoirs of Sir Phillip Francis, Vol. II, pp. 375-376.



monk here, who added that he was now resolved 'not to live any longer amongst the Christians, but that he desired to live amongst the English,' 'But the English are Christians,' some one replied. 'Jesu Maria! exclaimed the amazed Spaniard; he had never before heard that such was the case.'" (p. 32).

Under these circumstances it was only common sense which led the East India Company not to allow as matters of policy the free resort of Englishmen to India and of Christian Missionaries to preach Christianity to the "heathens" of this country.

But, as said before, the blockade of the ports of the continent by Napoleon made Englishmen turn their attention to India.

America was lost to England; and it seems that the natives of England were anxious to colonize India. But the exclusive character of the constitution of the East India Company was not favourable for the colonisation and settlement of the English in India. Adam Smith in his 'Wealth of Nations,' writes—

"Though the Europeans possess many considerable settlements both upon the coast of America and in the East Indies, they have not yet established in either of those countries such numerous and thriving colonies as those in the islands and continent of America. Africa, however, as well as several of the countries comprehended under the general name of the East Indies, are inhabited by barbarous nations. But those nations were by no

means so weak and defenceless as the miserable and helpless Americans: and in proportion to the natural fertility of the countries which they inhabited, they were besides much more populous. The most barbarous nations either of Africa or of the East Indies were shepherds; even the Hottentots were so. But the natives of every part of America, except Mexico and Peru, were only hunters; and the difference is very great between the number of shepherds and that of hunters whom the same extent of equally fertile territory can maintain. *In Africa and the East Indies, therefore, it was more difficult to displace the natives, and to extend the European plantations over the greater part of the land of the original inhabitants. The genius of exclusive companies, besides, is unfavorable,.....to the growth of new colonies. and has probably been the principal cause of the little progress which they have made in the East Indies.* The Portuguese carried on the trade both to Africa and the East Indies without any exclusive companies, and their settlements at Congo, Angola, and Benguela on the coast of Africa, and at Goa in the East Indies, though much depressed by superstition and every sort of bad government, yet bear some faint resemblance to the colonies of America and are partly inhabited by Portuguese who have been established there for several generations. The Dutch settlements at the Cape of Good Hope and at Batavia are at present the most considerable colonies which the Europeans have established either in Africa or in the East Indies, and both these settlements are peculiarly fortunate in their situations.....

"The English and Dutch Companies, though they have established no considerable colonies, except the two above mentioned, have both made considerable conquests in the East Indies. But in the manner in which they

both govern their new subjects, the natural genius of an exclusive Company has shown itself most distinctly. In the Spice Islands the Dutch are said to burn all the spiceries which a fertile season produces beyond what they expect to dispose of in Europe with such a profit as they think sufficient.....By different acts of oppression they have reduced the population of several of the Moluccas nearly to the number which is sufficient to supply with fresh provisions and other necessities of life their own insignificant garrisons, and such of their ships as occasionally come there for a cargo of spices. Under the Government even of the Portuguese, however, those islands are said to have been tolerably well inhabited.

"The English Company have not yet had time to establish in Bengal so perfectly destructive a system. The plan of their government, however, has had exactly the same tendency.....The servants of the Company have upon several occasions attempted to restrain the production of the particular articles of which they have thus usurped the monopoly, not only to the quantity which they themselves could purchase, but to that which they could expect to sell with such a profit as they might think sufficient. *In the course of a century or two the policy of the English company would in this manner have probably proved as completely destructive as that of the Dutch.*"

The genius then of the East India Company was unfavourable to the colonization of India by the English. The natives of England had to pay more for the products, both natural and manufactured, of the East Indies because of the mono-

polies enjoyed by the Company. Adam Smith wrote :—

“Since the establishment of the English, East India Company,...the other inhabitants of England, over and above being excluded from the trade, must have paid in the price of the East India goods which they have consumed, not only for all the extraordinary profits which the Company may have made upon those goods in consequence of their monopoly, but for all the extraordinary waste which the fraud and abuse, inseparable from the management of the affairs of so great a Company, must necessarily have occasioned. The absurdity of this second kind of monopoly, therefore, is much more manifest than that of the first.”

The remedy, therefore, which suggested itself to the natives of England was to deprive the Company of its exclusive nature. They considered this measure as best calculated to pour into the lap of England the golden treasures of India.

[ Why, Adam Smith wrote :—

[ “The trade to the East Indies, if it were altogether free, would probably absorb the greater part of this redundant capital. The East Indies offer a market both for the manufactures of Europe and for the gold and silver as well as for several other productions of America, greater and more extensive than both Europe and America put together.”

By losing its exclusive nature, the Company would facilitate the settlement and colonisation of India by English adventurers.

All these advantages were dangling before the

eyes of the natives of England, and so they determined to deprive the Company of its exclusive character. But how to do it was the question.

They hit upon the novel idea that they wanted to civilize the people of India. The natives of India were according to them uncivilized barbarians and their coming in contact with the English would raise them in the scale of civilisation. They were heathens and so missionaries of the Christian persuasion were to be permitted to settle in India to lead them out of darkness. At the same time, Bishops and other ministers of the Christian faith were appointed and they were to be paid out of the revenues of India.

But these were all very plausible arguments which were meant to cover their ulterior designs, the nature of which has been sufficiently indicated above.

Section 33 of Act 53 Geor. III. Cap. 155 passed on 21st July, 1813, ran as follows :—

“And whereas it is the duty of this country to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions in India : and such measures ought to be adopted as may tend to the introduction among them of useful knowledge, and of religious and moral improvement ; and in furtherance of the above objects, sufficient facilities ought to be afforded by law to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India for the purpose of accomplishing those benevolent designs, so as the authority of the local governments



respecting the intercourse of Europeans with the interior of the country be preserved, and the principles of the British Government, on which the natives of India have hitherto relied for the free exercise of their religion be inviolably maintained ; and whereas it is expedient to make provision for granting permission to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India for the above purposes, and also to persons desirous of going to and remaining there for other lawful purposes ; be it therefore enacted,.....that such person or persons shall be furnished by the said Court of Directors with a certificate or certificates...signifying that such person or persons hath or have so proceeded with the cognizance and under the sanction of the said Court of Directors ;”

Before we mention the steps which were taken “to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions in India,” it is necessary to advert to the evidence of the witnesses who were examined before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the occasion of the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company in 1813. Almost all of those witnesses who knew anything of India were opposed to the increased resort of the English to India or of Christian Missionaries to preach the gospels to the heathens. Warren Hastings, the first Governor-General of India, Sir Thomas Munro, Sir John Malcolm, Sir John Shore (afterwards Lord Teignmouth), the *Christian* (the epithet is not ours) Director of the East Indian Company, Mr. Charles Grant, and several other well known Anglo-

Indians spoke in strong terms of the inadvisability of allowing the increased resort of Europeans to India. Warren Hastings

“Expressed it as his opinion, that if Europeans were admitted generally to go into the country, to mix with the inhabitants or form establishments amongst them, the consequence would certainly and inevitably be the ruin of the country ; they would insult, plunder and oppress the natives, and no laws enacted from home could prevent them from committing acts of licentiousness of every kind with impunity. A general feeling of hostility to the government would be excited ; and although the armed force might be of sufficient strength to suppress any overt acts of insurrection, yet the stability of the Empire must be endangered by universal discontent.”\*

Other Anglo-Indian witnesses bore testimony similar to the above. Sir John Malcolm, in his evidence with respect to the free admission of Europeans into India, said :—

“I think of all the powers which are vested in the Local Government, there is none more essential to its existence in full vigor and force, than that which enables them to restrain the local residence of every individual European to a particular part of the Empire. If British subjects were allowed to go in the manner described to India, the effects would be various, agreeably to the places to which they went. If to the Presidencies where British courts of law are established, there

---

\* Mill and Wilson's History of British India, Vol. VII. p. 375.

would be no other danger, I conceive, resulting from them, but what might arise from their great numbers, and the changes in the condition of the society, and eventually and gradually of the government from that circumstance, but if they went to any ports where there was no established authority to control them, and if they proceeded into the interior of the country, there would no doubt be much mischief arising from those quarrels which must inevitably ensue with the natives, which mischief would vary from a hundred local causes connected with the character of the natives of the places to which they resorted."

Relative to Malcolm's examination, Sir James Mackintosh made the following entry in his diary:—

"He (Malcolm) is to give strong testimony in favour of the Company's favourite argument, that a free trade will lead to an influx of Europeans, which will produce insult and oppression to the natives, and at last drive them into rebellion, which must terminate in our expulsion."

Mr. Charles Grant in his pamphlet on the State of Society in Asia, wrote:—

"If the subjects of this country are permitted, at their pleasure, to visit those possessions as they may our American colonies, though professedly but for the purposes of traffic, great numbers of them will settle; for mercantile transactions must entail residence, because it will be impossible for a Government to say, that all such transactions shall be closed, and the parties be gone within a certain time, or to take cognizance in this manner of the conduct of every individual; and if such a measure



were at first attempted, it would not continue any time. All the lines of trade and manufactures would soon be overstocked, and then men would seek fasten themselves on the soil. Colonization would therefore very soon commence in India, especially in Bengal: those whom uncontrolled enterprizes in commerce would carry thither would see a rich soil apprehend great scope for exertions, and regard the natives as a subjected people, feeble, timid, and contemptible; all things would tempt them, and many both agents and seamen, would remain. But the increase of Europeans there would not be regulated by gradual progress of colonial industry. Multitudes of the needy and the idle, allured by the fame of that country, and eager to seize noble privileges, would flock thither at once. Britain would, in a short space, be thinned of inhabitants, and those eastern provinces filled with a new race of adventurers, many of them low and licentious. Being there, they must subsist; they would spread themselves throughout the country, would run into the inland trade, fix themselves wherever they could on the lands, domineer over the natives, harass, extrude, exasperate them, and at length provoke them to plots and insurrections; they would be bold and assuming towards our own Government there. In a certain degree we should have that lawless destructive scene acted over again, which the Spaniards exhibited when they first poured into America. It was thus that the Portuguese power in the East declined. The intolerable license of the roving adventurers of that nation rendered them odious to the natives, and armed the coasts and islands of India against them, so that weakened before they fell an easy prey to the Dutch. And thus too, we should ourselves be exposed, perhaps at no distant period, to

the danger of general convulsion and revolt in those possessions, which prudently guarded and cultivated, may under the favour of Providence, to conciliate which should be our first care, be preserved for ages, to our great advantage, and the happiness of their native inhabitants.

"The question now therefore, with respect to these possessions is not, whether all British subjects shall have a right to trade thither in their own persons, but whether the natives shall be protected from being overrun and oppressed by foreigners."

But the fiat had gone forth that the Indian trade was to be thrown open to the merchants of England and, therefore, no attention was to be paid to the evidence of those who were competent to speak on the subject with authority. When the subject was discussed in the House of Commons on the 25th of May, 1813, the speakers who were opposed to the abolition of the monopoly of the trade privileges of the East India Company brought forward very weighty arguments against the proposed change.

Mr. Charles Grant, Senior, the reputed "Christian Director of the East India Company" and his son, Mr. Charles Grant, Junior, were opposed to the throwing open of the trade of India to the general merchants of England. The latter

"impressed upon the House the peril of disturbing a system of administration under which the people of India were prosperous and happy, for the sake of imaginary

commercial advantages which never could be realised. The good of the people of India was the real point at issue; and this could not be promoted by letting loose amongst them a host of desperate, needy adventurers, whose atrocious conduct in America and in Africa afforded sufficient indication of the evils they would inflict upon India. The Company had been charged with having excited wars in India, and furnished an exception to the general rule that peace and tranquility were the inseparable attendants of commerce: and by whom was this charge made? *By the advocates of the slave-trade, the people of Liveropool.*".\*

But all these arguments were of no avail. The happiness and prosperity of millions of the inhabitants of India could not outweigh the lust for gold of the natives of England. The "heathens" of India were represented to be barbarians and, therefore, it was necessary to civilize them. But then those heathens did not stand in need of the luxurious articles of English manufacture and there was no market for them in India. India manufactured everything to meet the wants of her population. The evidence of no Britisher is more persuasive and eloquent on the subject than that of Sir Thomas Munro. In his memorandum on opening the trade with India to the out ports, 1st February 1813, he wrote:—

"Now as to the exports ( from England to India )

---

\* Mill and Wilson's History of British India, Vol. VII. p. 381.

it is not likely that they will ever, unless very slowly, be much extended ; opposed by moral and physical obstacles, by religion, by civil institutions, by climate, and by the skill and ingenuity of the people of India.

"No nation will take from another what it can furnish cheaper and better itself. In India, almost every article which the inhabitants require is made cheaper and better than in Europe. Among these are all cotton and silk manufactures, leather, paper, domestic utensils of brass and iron, and implements of agriculture. Their coarse woollens, though bad, will always keep their ground, from their superior cheapness. Their finer camblets are warmer and more lasting than ours.

"Glass-ware is in little request, except with a very few principal natives, and, among them, is confined to mirrors and lamps, and it is only such natives as are much connected with Europeans, who purchase these articles..... Their simple mode of living dictated both by caste and climate, renders all our furniture and ornaments for the decoration of the house and the table utterly unserviceable to the Hindoos ; .....

"These simple habits are not peculiar to the Hindoos. The Mohammadan also, with a few exceptions among the higher classes, conforms to them.

"If we reason from the past to the future, we can have no well-founded expectation of any considerable extension of our exports. If it were as easy, as some suppose, to introduce the use of foreign articles, it would have been done long ago.

"From the most distant ages of antiquity, there was a constant intercourse between India and the countries on the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, without the introduction of foreign manufactures among the Hindoos ; and

since the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope, there has been an extensive trade with the Western nations of Europe, without any one of them having been more successful than the ancients in prevailing upon the Hindoos to change their customs so far as to use their commodities in preference to their own. Neither the Portuguese, the Dutch, the French, nor the English, have in this respect effected any considerable change ;.....

"...Besides the peculiar customs and institutions and climate of India, we must look to the superior skill of the Indian workmen. We cannot profitably export to them until our own fabrics excel theirs. When this is accomplished, no extraordinary skill will be required to extend the sale. The Indians will purchase, even though we should endeavour to prevent them, just as we in this country purchase the contraband stuffs of India.

"...The grand obstacles to our exports are the inability of the Indians to purchase our commodities, and the cheapness and excellence of their own. It is obvious, therefore, that their demand for ours can only be enlarged either by a general improvement in the condition of the natives of India, or by a reduction in the price of European articles.....In seeking, therefore, to extend our exports, cheapness is not the only requisite,...the tastes of the natives must also be studied.....

On the whole, there is no ground to look for any considerable increase in the demand for our manufactures by the natives of India, unless by very slow steps, and at a very distant period ;.....

Of course, Sir Thomas Munro was a paid servant of the Company and, therefore, to be true to the salt he ate, he advocated that the Company



should be allowed to possess their monopoly of trade. He wrote :

"The East India Company are attacked from all quarters, as if they alone, in this kingdom, possessed exclusive privileges. But monopoly pervades all our institutions. All corporations are inimical to the natural rights of British subjects. The corn laws favor the landed interest, at the expense of the public. The laws against the export of wool, and many others, are of the same nature ; and likewise those by which West India commodities are protected and enhanced in price. It would be better for the community that the West India planter should be permitted to export his produce direct to all countries, and that the duties on East India sugar, etc., should be lowered."

As proved to demonstration, there was no market for European manufactures in India. But this was to be created for the benefit of the people of England. Under the circumstances mentioned above by Munro, there was no other way of effecting this than that of ruining Indian industries. How they did this will be evident from the following often quoted passage from Wilson's 'History of British India' :

"The history of the trade of cotton cloths with India affords a singular exemplification of the inapplicability to all times and circumstances of that principle of free trade which advocates the unrestricted admission of a cheap article, in place of protecting by heavy duties a dearer one of home manufacture. *It is also a melancholy instance of the wrong done to India by the country on*

*which she had become dependent.* It was stated in evidence, that the cotton and silk goods of India up to this period could be sold for a profit in the British market, at a price from fifty to sixty per cent. lower than those fabricated in England. It consequently became necessary to protect the latter by duties of seventy and eighty per cent. on their value, or by positive prohibition. Had this not been the case, had not such prohibitory duties and decrees existed the mills of Paisley and Manchester would have been stopped in their outset and could scarcely have been again set in motion, even by the powers of steam. *They were created by the sacrifice of the Indian manufacture.* Had India been independent, she would have retaliated; would have imposed preventive duties upon British goods, and would thus have preserved her own productive industry from annihilation. This act of self-defence was not permitted her; she was at the mercy of the stranger. British goods were forced upon her without paying any duty; and the foreign manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms.”\*

In this connection, the speech of Mr. Tierney may also be referred to. The author who has been quoted above, in summarising his speech, says:—

“The singularity of the debate was a long and elaborate speech from Mr. Tierney, who, in opposition to the sentiments of his colleagues, maintained that, looking to the distinguished character and generally concurring

---

\* Vol. VII. p. 385.

tenor of the evidence adduced in favor of the Company, and the total absence of any evidence on the opposite part, the existing system ought not to be interfered with. In fact, there was a gross inconsistency in the resolution; a Court of Directors that could not be trusted with the commerce of India was to be confirmed in the government,—twenty-four execrable merchants were to make excellent political governors! But there was no charge against the Company.

.....*Amongst all the arguments in favor of the benefits that were to accrue to the people of India from a free trade he had never heard it proposed to allow one manufacture of India to be freely imported into Great Britain. It was true that they would allow cotton twist: but then, having found that they could weave by means of machinery cheaper than the Indians, they said to them 'Leave off weaving; supply us with the raw material,—and we will weave for you.' Now, although this was a natural principle enough for merchants and manufacturers, it was rather too much to talk of the philanthropy of it, or to rank the supporters 'of it as in a peculiar degree the friends of India. If, instead of calling themselves the friends of that country, they should profess themselves its enemies, what more could they do than advise the endeavour to crush all Indian manufacture? What would be said of the East India Company if they were to show as decided a preference to the manufactures of the natives of India under their protection as we did to the manufactures of England? .....he would defy any man to point out anything like the good of India being the object of any of the resolutions.'\**

---

\* Ibid pp. 384-385.



But no reasons and no arguments were of any avail. Indian industries were deliberately crushed by England in order "to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions in India." They were talking of civilizing the people of India by the establishment of an open trade. When Sir Thomas Munro was asked his opinion on the subject, he gave the following characteristic reply :—

"I do not understand what is meant by the civilization of the Hindus ;. . . . . But if a good system of agriculture, unrivalled manufacturing skill, a capacity to produce whatever can contribute to convenience or luxury ; schools established in every village for teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic ; the general practice of hospitality and charity amongst each other ; and above all, a treatment of the female sex full of confidence, respect and delicacy, are among the signs which denote a civilised people, then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe ; and if civilisation is to become an article of trade between the two countries, I am convinced that this country (England) will gain by the import cargo."

But the Christian natives of England were bent upon civilizing the heathens of India by means of (1) free trade, (2) permitting free influx of the English into India, (3) allowing Christian Missionaries to preach the gospel to the heathens, and (4) imparting instruction in English.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE FREE INFLUX OF ENGLISHMEN INTO INDIA

Under the pretext of civilising India a one-sided free trade was imposed. One of the means the natives of England devised for improving their trade in India was the free influx of their co-religionists and compatriots into that country. Europeans were not freely allowed to sojourn or settle in the territories in India then under the jurisdiction of the East India Company. The Britishers wished to remove these restrictions so as to enable their kith and kin to go in large numbers to India. They believed that this would expand their commerce and increase the sale of English goods. They knew full well that the step which they proposed was not the one calculated to promote the happiness of the natives of India. Indeed, on this point almost all the witnesses examined before the Select Committees of both the houses were unanimous. We reproduce below the evidence of some of those who were competent to speak with authority on the subject.

Mr. Warren Hastings examined before the Lord's Committee said :—

“It is impossible that the English character should

coalesce with the natives in the same state of society. In the higher class of the British subjects this effect may not be deduced; but if Europeans are admitted generally to go into the country to mix with the inhabitants and to form establishments amongst them, the consequences must certainly and inevitably prove the ruin of the country; they will insult, plunder, and oppress the natives because they can do it with impunity; no laws that can be enacted from hence can at such a distance, and under the cover of so many circumstances as will occur in that country, prevent them from committing acts of licentiousness of every kind with impunity; the arrogance and boldness of their spirit will encourage them too far to do everything that their own interests may prompt them to. In India at a distance from the capital settlements, the name of an Englishman is his protection, and a sanction for many offences which he would not dare to commit at home. \* \* \* \* There a tacit idea prevails universally in the minds of all British subjects not only in India, but I believe with a feebler or deeper impression even at home, the idea of common participation which every British subject possesses in the sovereignty of the Company:—‘Since *we* became masters of the country,’ ‘*our* native subjects,’ and other phrases of a similar import constantly occur in our books, in our writings, as well as in the language of familiar conversation. These ideas in the lower orders of British subjects rise to the height of despotism, and are liable to all the excesses of despotism, whenever the prerogatives annexed to it can be asserted with impunity: with such a disparity, the aggrieved Indian loses his confidence; he is timid by nature, and not easily provoked to resistance where danger may be apprehended; but though this is a part of their individual character, cases

may be supposed in which the provocation of a general grievance may excite the whole people, or detached members of them, to all the ferocities of insurrection: this, however is not very liable to happen, and I hope never will. Very great and almost insuperable will be the difficulties of obtaining redress should the native Indian be under a necessity of appealing for it to the courts of justice established in the country: these will always be at a great distance from the complainant, because he cannot afford the loss of a day's labour, which procures him his daily subsistence, in appealing to them. The same difficulties will occur in collecting witnesses, and procuring their attendance: and these combined will be more likely to prevent his complaining at all, than a too quick sense of injury to give occasion for his complaining without sufficient reason. \* \* \* \*

"If a free trade were authorised by law between this country and British India, and Englishmen were allowed to fix their residence in any part of our Indian possessions according to their pleasure, and without restraint, is it your opinion that any ill consequences from such permission would ensue to the tranquility and happiness of the natives of India under the Government of the Company? I answer confidently, that it would prove ruinous to the country, and very injurious to the peace of the inhabitants.

"Are you of opinion that ill consequences would follow from such permission to the stability of the British Empire in India? I am indeed. \* \* \* \*

"If there were any considerable increase in the intercourse of Englishmen with the natives of India, are you of opinion that it would have an ill effect upon the opinions of the natives of India relative to the character of Englishmen?—Most undoubtedly they would naturally

draw their opinion of the character of the country from the conduct of those with whom they were immediately conversant, and every act of injustice, for which they could receive no redress, would dwell upon their minds, with a strong prejudice against the Government itself, supposing it to permit them.

“Are you of opinion that such an idea so generated in the minds of the natives might eventually be prejudicial to the stability of the British Government in India?—A strong armed force may be sufficient to suppress and keep down any spirit of revolt arising in the minds of the people. We must always keep up a strong standing force in that country; but so much depends for the peace of the country and the stability of the Government upon the attachment of the people, that it would be very unsafe and impolitic to trust to that security only. \* \* In short, I do not believe that any nation upon earth is safe from the worst effects which may follow from a general discontent of its people.”

In his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, Mr. Warren Hastings said :—

“Twenty years ago when the present Charter was under consideration, I addressed a letter to the Chairman, or Chairmen for the time being of the Court of Directors upon this very subject : in which, so far as I can trust to my recollection, I strongly urged the necessity of providing against the irruption of British adventurers into India, and beyond the bounds of our settlements ; arguing from it, that they would molest and oppress the people, and plunder the country ; and I believed I expressed a wish that some provision should be made



against it in the Charter then depending. I have either lost or mislaid the letter so that I have no access to any copy of it : therefore I can only speak to its identity, and to the general import of it. I mention this to show that it is not a novel doctrine which I humbly deliver to this honourable House. My letter, I know, was seen, and I have a pleasure in thinking that it was approved, by the gentleman that then presided over the Board of Commissioners for the affairs of India : a man who certainly, if it could be said of any man, required no light from the judgement of another to aid his own : and, therefore, it would be the height of arrogance in me to suppose that I had any share of merit in the event which followed. I have mentioned the fact only to show, how early my opinion was formed, and with what anxiety and earnestness I acted upon it. A clause was inserted by Mr. Dundas, in the Act of Parliament, and in the Charter constituted from it, by which it was enacted, 'that no British subject not being a servant of the East India Company should be allowed to reside in India, except at the principal settlements ; unless by a special license from the Company or the Governors of India.' This license I thought defeated the essential purpose of the prohibitory clause ; but I waited till another occasion induced me again to address the Court of Directors through the similar official channel of the Chairman and deputy Chairman of that body ; which I did, in a letter dated the 12th of March 1802, strongly remonstrating against this exception to the general clause as liable to be productive of greater mischiefs from the few favoured Europeans who were allowed the benefit of it than if all men indiscriminatively were allowed to possess the same privilege. Again, on the 28th of April last, I a third time took up the same subject, and



addressed a letter upon it to the present Chairman of the Court of Directors, re-iterating my former objections, and the arguments connected with them, and proposing as a means of preventing the deprecated abuses, certain restrictions to which I have alluded in my answer to one of the first questions proposed to me. 'This letter contains all that I had written upon the same subject in my preceding letter of March 1802, in a quotation from it. This will, and the first letter which I have mentioned, would (if I could produce it), strongly prove that such always was my opinion. This honourable House will have ample means of knowing, from more recent testimony than mine, whether the mischiefs which I apprehended have actually come to pass, and the records of the Court of Directors will afford a more authentic evidence still of their existence, if they have existed. I have the permission of the Court of Directors, in whose possession the last letter is, and I humbly refer this honorable House to it : and if this shall appear to be clearly the case, the inferences that I drew, so long ago as twenty years past, of the connexion between the allowance of British adventurers in India, not in the service of the Company, with its influence on the peace of it, and the re-iteration of the same opinion through so long a series of time, are no longer argumentative; they are predictive : and in that sense are an irrefragable proof, that such consequences must inevitably follow such premises.'

Mr. William Cowper told the Lords' Committee that :—

"Uninformed as the European must be of everything that it was important to him to know of the habits, the customs, the prejudices, the peculiarities, the laws, and the religion, both of the Mahomedan and Hindoo inhabi-

tants, he would ignorantly in a thousand ways be exposed to violate some and give offence in others; it cannot be supposed that some violences would not be committed by the European; this would tend to exasperate both the Hindoo and Mussalman population, and supposing that those adventurers were multiplied to the extent that the question I imagine intends, would lead to universal disorder, anarchy and confusion in the interior, infallibly as I should think."

Sir John Malcolm, as a witness before the Lords' Committee was examined as follows:—

"Is it your opinion that much less danger is likely to arise to the peace and happiness of the inhabitants of British India from intercourse with Englishmen, who, from their long residence in that country, are acquainted with their manners and prejudices, than with persons coming from this country unacquainted with any of their manners and prejudices, and therefore from ignorance likely to offend them? No doubt. \* \* \* \*

"In case then any act of violence should be committed by any free trader or his agent, at the distance of several hundred miles from Calcutta, do you conceive it possible that the natives can have adequate justice against such trader or his agent? It would be attended with very great delay and inconvenience no doubt."

Lord Teignmouth in his evidence before the Lords' Committee, said:—

"An unrestrained admission of Europeans into the country, \* \* \* would certainly in my opinion be attended with very great inconvenience and embarrassment to the Government of the country, and

might probably be attended with mischievous and dangerous consequences. \* \*

"The admission of a number of Europeans into the interior of Bengal, of people unacquainted with the habits and customs of the natives of that country and many of them entertaining a contempt for them, would probably be attended with this inconvenience, that they would often violate the prejudices of the natives by their conduct, and excite a considerable degree of irritation in the natives by such conduct; but whether it would be attended with evil consequences to the peace of the country, generally speaking, I feel some hesitation in giving any positive opinion; there is another instance in which I think the unrestrained admission of Europeans \* \* would also be attended with bad consequences, that it would tend to lower the British character in the estimate of the natives; and that might be deemed a dangerous effect, when the great disproportion between the inhabitants of India and the number of Europeans is taken into consideration.\* \* \* \*

"Supposing that irritation which your Lordship has supposed would take place in the minds of the natives from unrestrained intercourse with Europeans, and supposing that degradation of European character in their opinion which your Lordship has alluded to, do you not think it might ultimately affect the stability of the British Empire in India?—A long course of irritation and an increasing sentiment of degradation, might lead to such an effect."

Major General Alexander Kyd's evidence before the Lords' Committee is so important, that copious extracts from it are reproduced below.

"From the experience you have had on this subject

are you able to form a conjecture with respect to the probable effect of an unrestrained intercourse between British persons and the native inhabitants of India?—I think from my own observation it would be fraught with very dangerous consequences, \* \* \*

“On what observed peculiarities in the character or usages of the natives do you find that opinion?—It is an unfortunate circumstance, but it is certainly true, that the character of the lower class of Europeans is, to hold in utter contempt and to despise the character of the natives; and on all occasions, where I have observed they have had the smallest authority, they never fail to treat them ill. There is another circumstance that is equally unfortunate, that almost all the lower classes of Europeans are addicted to spirituous liquors when they can get them. Spirituous liquors are to be got in every village or market in the country at a trifling price, and therefore, they naturally will indulge in them, and in their intemperance ill-treat the natives.

“Do you remember having seen instances in which this observation was verified?—In my own experience I had occasion to employ a vast number of European overseers, which in general were taken from the military and were recommended to me as men of the best character, but in the end I found that it was impossible to delegate to them the smallest power, and I was obliged to leave off the employment of Europeans, from their habit of ill-treating the natives, and to take to native superintendents, in the works I was carrying on \* \* \* \*

“Supposing traders to go from this country with British crews, would any abuses happen with respect to the native vessels of which you have spoken, and of which the crews and captains and owners are exclusive-

ly natives?—Upon that subject I own I have some opinions that may probably appear strange; but I very much fear that several of those disappointed traders would most likely wish to make good their losses, and might be induced to commit depredations upon those defenceless vessels; and in consequence this free and open communication of ships of all descriptions might frequently lead to those depredations; I am almost certain it would do it.

“Do you find that opinion upon any historical fact?—We know there have been traders in former times, who even went the length of a regular system of piracy.” \*

“You have stated that in the public works carried on under your direction in India, you latterly preferred the employment of natives, as superintendents, to Europeans; what opinion has that enabled you to form respecting the capacity of the natives when so instructed and employed?—The capacity of the natives respecting carrying on all works of ingenuity, is beyond what people in general can conceive. I have executed, with natives alone, buildings of all descriptions, made up furniture of every kind, in short directed them to cast cannon; there is nothing that I understood myself, but what I could get the native artificers to execute, and in a very superior manner; they are a very ingenious and a very intelligent people.”

Yet the natives of India were represented as savages, whom it was considered the duty of England to civilize.

Mr. Thomas Graham was examined before the Lords' Committee.

“Supposing a considerable and indiscriminate influx of Europeans, in consequence of an open trade from every



port in the United Kingdom to every port within the limits of the Company's Charter, what political or other consequences would you apprehend from such increased and indiscriminate influx?—I do not conceive that it would be practicable for the regulators of the government there to restrain them from those communications which might lead to commotion.

“Will you describe the kinds of communication which you apprehend might lead to such commotion?—The trespasses which they might commit upon their religious prejudices.”

According to Sir Thomas Munro

“the general intercourse of Europeans with such a country (India) would certainly be productive of very bad consequences. \* \* I think that men recently arrived from Europe, without any knowledge of the language or manners of the people, would be too much accustomed to exercise acts of violence to their religious and civil feeling and prejudices, and by that means to excite discontent at, and occasion constant affrays and appeals to, the authorities established there.”

Further on Sir Thomas Munro corrected himself by saying :—

“When I spoke of European merchants lately arrived from Europe committing acts of violence against the inhabitants and natives, I did not mean to confine my remarks entirely to merchants, I extend it to all Europeans, civil and military, Company's servants and King's when they first land, from their ignorance of the manners of the natives, from seeing them apparently so mild, they are apt to treat them with contempt, and to commit acts of outrage that they would not do in their



own country : they consider themselves in India as part of a nation of conquerors, and they are very apt to act as such in their own persons."

The questions which were put to Mr. William Young, and the answers which he gave to those questions in his evidence before the Lords' committee are reproduced below :—

"What do you conceive would be the effect of an unrestrained intercourse between the natives of that country and the natives of this?---I should think it would lead to very disagreeable consequences.

"Will you describe in what way you conceive those disagreeable consequences would arise?—I think that they would arise from their interference with the manners, customs, usages, and religious prejudices of the people." \* \* \* \*

"Do you apprehend then, that an unlimited influx of Europeans into that country would produce consequences dangerous to the happiness of the natives and the stability of the British Government?—I think, that unless very great restrictions indeed were imposed upon them, it would."

Mr. John Stracey told the Lords' Committee.

"I should certainly think if British subjects are allowed to go when and where they please, through the different provinces, the greatest injury would arise in every respect ; and if they are to go in an unlimited manner, and to be under no restraint to the different courts established in the provinces, I think they would all of them, or at least most of them, be guilty of the greatest excesses and enormities."

Then he was asked :—

“Do you not believe that if such a state of circumstances were to take place as has been just supposed, it would create great disturbance in the native population against the English Government?—I certainly think it would.

“Are you of opinion that if such enormities were committed, they would materially tend to lower the character of the English in the eyes of the natives?—If they could not obtain redress, I should certainly think it would.

“Supposing it were practicable to establish provincial jurisdiction in that country, to which the English might be subject, are you of opinion that the frequent punishment of Englishmen by such jurisdiction would tend to degrade the character of the nation in the eyes of the natives?—I think it possibly may; but that is so general a question, the effect of it I cannot speak to: I am of opinion that no Europeans should be allowed in the interior of the country, except British subjects, and those British subjects to go under a specific licence from the different Governments, as is the case at present.”

It is unnecessary to give the opinion of other witnesses examined before the Select Committees of the two houses of Parliament. As said before they were all agreed that it was undesirable to allow a free influx of Europeans in India.

But in the face of these testimonies the natives of England persisted in inducing the Indian authorities to permit their co-religionists and compatriots a free access without let or hindrance

to every part of India. They were told that this would not promote the happiness of the people of India. But what did they care for the happiness of the heathens of that country? They only cared for that which would put money into their own pockets. For, they believed that the measure which they proposed was the one calculated to prove beneficial to their commerce. Why, the larger the European population in India, the greater will be the consumption of European goods by them. Mr. Robert Morris was examined as a witness before the Lords' Committee. He said that there was no prospect of an extension of an export trade from England to India, unless there were a greater number of Europeans in that country to consume them. He was asked :—

“Do you conceive there is much prospect of an extension of an export trade of the articles described?—Not under the present circumstances of the country, I mean unless there are a greater number of Europeans to consume them.

“Supposing it to be a fact, that the exports of European articles to India have, of late years, been considerably augmented, do you conceive that such augmentation has been owing to any increased consumption of European commodities amongst the natives of India?—I do not ; or in a very small degree, probably some few articles, such as fine glassware for ornaments, for their houses, but of no others that I am acquainted with.”

The evidence of Mr. William Fairlie was also

to the same purport. Being examined before the Lords' Committee :—

“Do you know whether, during the last twenty years, there has not been an increased export of European articles and manufactures to India?—A very great one. I think ; but chiefly, I should think, owing to the increased number of Europeans now in the service of the Company ; the Company's Military and Civil Service have greatly increased, the King's regiments have greatly increased, and the number of Europeans is twenty or thirty to one, as compared to the time I went, thirty years ago.”

The presence of a large number of Europeans in India would *directly* lead to a greater consumption of European goods, and also *indirectly* lead to the same end by making the natives imitate European manners and thus become customers of European goods. It was also supposed that the intercourse of natives with Europeans would induce them to consume European goods.

Mr. David Vanderhayden, M. P. was examined before the Lords' Committee.

“Can you state whether, at the presidency of Calcutta, any growing conformity was discoverable, on the part of the natives, to European fashions or habits?—None to European habits ; in some degree it may be with respect to fashions amongst the highest class of the people, I mean in the use of carriages or articles of furniture, such as looking glasses or glassware in a very moderate degree.

“Do you ascribe this slight progress of European fa-

shions among natives of distinction to their intercourse with Europeans or to any other cause?—*Of course it must have arisen from their intercourse with Europeans.*

"Do you apprehend, that in the interior of the country, on the supposition that no great intercourse should be allowed to Europeans with natives, the consumption of European manufactures could be materially promoted?—I do not think that under any circumstances the consumption of European commodities in the interior is likely to be increased, for the reasons I have before stated."

Yes, whatever demand there arose for European goods amongst natives was due to their intercourse with Europeans. And it was, therefore, considered necessary to permit Europeans to penetrate into the interior of India in order to promote the commerce in European goods.

Then again the free influx of a large number of Europeans into India brought into existence that class of hybrids known as half-castes or Eurasians, and thus leading to an increased consumption of European goods. Major General Alexander Kyd was examined before the Lords' Committee.

"Is it therefore likely, in your opinion, that under any circumstances or any system whatever, the manufactures of this country can obtain a very increased sale among the great mass of the Indian population?—In considering that question, I have been long of opinion, that it is not possible to increase the consumption of European articles to a much greater degree than it is at present among the



natives : but *it will go on progressively with our success in India, and with the increase of Europeans, and their children (half-caste), whose manners and habits are the same, and therefore use the same articles as their fathers.*"

In the course of their letter dated East India House, 27th February, 1818, Messrs. John Bebb and James Pattison wrote to the Right Hon'ble George Canning :

"The half-caste will increase in numbers more rapidly in proportion as facilities are extended to Europeans to settle in India."

These were the considerations which led the natives of England, a nation of shop-keepers, to demand the free influx of Europeans to every part of India. Although some English natives would have been glad to see India converted into a colony, yet perhaps the thinking portion of them did not consider it good for them to see India colonised by their compatriots. Why ? Because that might have diminished the export trade of England to India, instead of increasing it. Sir John Malcolm in his evidence before the Lords' Committee said :—

"The facility of intercourse with India, from leading to the establishment in that country of a great number of European artisans and mechanics, will, I conceive, lead to a diminution of the exports of a great number of European articles. The manufacture of leather, lately established in Madras, has already not only furnished European accoutrements, but all species of articles down to ladies' gloves. Carriages and other conveyances are made by European artisans at Calcutta, all kinds of



furniture, all kinds of silver work, and in short, everything they can. The cheapness of the labour of natives, whom they teach to work under the superintendence of Europeans, in those arts, not only enables them to sell these articles cheaper, but is likely to be one means of introducing all such articles to more general use in the country, as they will become more within the compass of the means of the natives to purchase."

But India was not going to be made into a colony and the English people were taking steps to crush Indian industries rather than to encourage them and make India a thriving and prosperous country. So the fears of Sir John Malcolm were groundless. The Europeans who were to be allowed free access to India were to play the part of "birds of prey and passage" in India. They were meant to promote the interest of the English people and not of India. Thus Sir Thomas Munro was asked by the Select Committee of the House of Commons:—

"Are you not of opinion that if easier access to India were allowed to persons bred to the cotton trade, and more practised and skilled than general merchants in distinguishing the different kinds of cotton used in British manufactures, such would soon discover the situations most favourable for the growth of each sort of cotton, the best means of cultivating them, and of keeping the finer separate from the coarser cottons?"

In answer, Sir Thomas Munro said:—

"I should have no doubt that if persons skilled in cotton were admitted into the interior of India, they

would probably find the means of improving the quality of the cotton."

The free influx of the Christian natives of England into India was meant for exploitation of India.

We have already reproduced above the statements of the several witnesses examined before the Committees of the two Houses who were almost unanimous in declaring that the free influx of Europeans would produce confusion, and disorder in India and the natives of that country would be oppressed and ill-treated by the white Christian adventurers and sojourners. The Right Honorable Lords, and the honourable members of the Lower House constituting the special Committees heard calmly the tale of sorrows that would befall the heathen natives by granting permission to their co-religionists and compatriots to freely resort to India. But what did they do? They perhaps did not believe in the proverb which says that "Prevention is better than cure." No, had they done so, they would have at once taken steps to make the regulations which existed at that time against the influx of Europeans into India more strict. No relaxation of those Regulations was desirable or advisable. Yet the free influx of Europeans into India, being a settled thing, it was proposed to make such regulations as would deter white sojourners in India from committing excesses

on its inhabitants. This looked something like inflicting a wound first and then applying some balm to relieve its pain and smarting.

But no regulations could have prevented the ill-treatment of Indians by the white Christian adventurers. Lord Teigumouth in his evidence before the Lords' Committee, said :—

“I do not think any regulations of Government could altogether prevent acts of injustice or oppression by Europeans in the interior, but that regulations might be so framed as to bring the offender to punishment in which case some of the evils would be mitigated.”

But the discontent of natives engendered by ill-treatment at the hands of the white sojourners was not to be removed by any regulations. Sir Thomas Munro on being examined before the Lords' Committee was asked :—

“If any violences were committed by such persons upon the natives, would it not be extremely difficult for them to obtain any adequate redress ?

He said :—

“I should think that even the granting them adequate redress would not exactly remove the causes of discontent.”

Similar was the testimony of several other witnesses.

But it was difficult, nay, almost impossible for any native to obtain redress when the offending party was a Christian white European.

No Christian white criminal was subject to the jurisdiction of any mofussil court in the interior. The British subjects were triable only in the Supreme Court of judicature established at the presidency. Mr. Thomas Cockburn, as a witness before the Lords' Committee was asked :—

“Are you aware that British subjects, for offences committed against the natives, are triable only in the Supreme Court of judicature established at the presidency ?”

In reply, he said :—

“I am aware of that being the case, and I consider it one of the great grievances under which our Indian subjects labour. It is not only in respect to assaults or irregularities affecting their persons, but in respect to their property ; a European, a British subject resident in the interior, licenced by the Government, by some construction of the law as it now stands, is considered even in regard to matters of property only amenable to the Supreme Courts ; but as the act of going into the interior is one of his own seeking, and suffered by the licence of Government, he enters into a bond to allow himself to be prosecuted in the courts established under the regulations of Government to the extent of 500 rupees, while the European has the power to prosecute a native subject of Great Britain to any extent to which his dealings may extend ; but if the native has larger demands upon the European than 500 rupees, he must proceed to the Supreme Court to prosecute him at the distance of sometimes hundreds, and in Bengal one thousand miles, at an expense not only ruinous, but he must leave his family, his pursuits, and I

may say everything that is dear to him, and which he has been accustomed to, for the purpose of obtaining redress at the presidencies, while other Europeans not British subjects, are considered amenable to the country courts:\* \* and this exception in favour of the British appears to me to give great reason for the natives to doubt the impartiality, if not the justice of the English Government. In criminal matters, a European, if informed against before a magistrate, is liable to be taken up by that magistrate, and witnesses are bound over to proceed to the Supreme Court whatever established, for the purpose of prosecution for the offence; of course, subject to the same inconveniences already described, except that in case of poverty, an allowance of two annas ( $3\frac{3}{4}d$ ) a day, I believe, is allowed to the witnesses to bear their expenses on such occasions, and in some particular cases, I believe, Government defray the expense of the prosecution."

Then he was asked :—

Could British subjects be made generally amenable to those district courts without offence to their national feelings and prejudices."

He answered :—

"In cases of life and death, I do not think it possible either consistent with British laws or British feeling, that they should be amenable to the country courts: but in all other cases whatsoever, I cannot but think it would be just to the people of India, that those Europeans, who for their own advantage seek a residence among them, with the licence and protection of the Company, should be equally amenable to the country courts, I mean the circuit courts, where European judges preside, as the natives among whom they reside and whom it is the bounden duty, as is prescribed by the law, that the British



Government should protect in their religion, their usages, and even their prejudices."

He was further questioned :—

"Were British subjects made amenable to the jurisdiction of the country courts, however consonant the frequent exercise of that jurisdiction might be to the dictates of justice, would it be in fact agreeable to the natural feelings and prejudices of Englishmen?"

Mr. Cockburn truly observed :—

"As justice is the first principle in the heart of an Englishman, and as Englishmen place themselves in the situation described voluntarily, it is for themselves to consider whether they will do so, knowing that they will be amenable to trial by their countrymen, who preside in the courts to which I allude."

As the law stood in those days, the Christian white sojourners often considered it a good fun to take the life of a heathen black or brown native of this country. If they were in the interior of the country, by the committal of such a crime, they would at the expense of the State, be sent to the Presidency to take their trial before the Supreme Court. This gave them an opportunity to see the Presidency and thus relieve the monotonous life which they led in the mofussil often several hundreds of miles distant from the Presidency town. The author of *Fifteen Years in India* mentions an anecdote which is worth transcribing here, for it adorns a tale and points a moral.

"One great defect in the judicial establishments in



India, however, is that the supreme criminal courts have such a vast extent of jurisdiction over Europeans, and the perpetrators of crimes have to be brought from such a distance for trial, before punishment can be inflicted, that the salutary effect of it in prevention is in a great measure lost. A short anecdote will illustrate this : His Majesty's 17th regiment of foot was for a long time stationed on the northern frontier, upwards of one thousand miles from Calcutta, and many of the soldiers began to despair of ever more seeing the presidency : from this feeling, seven of them entered into a conspiracy to murder a black man, under the impression that only one of them would be hanged for the crime, and that in the meantime they would all have a pleasant trip to Calcutta ; accordingly, a musket was loaded, and lots were drawn, and they proceeded together a little way from the cantonment in search of their victim, who was ploughing his field, when he received a bullet through his heart, from the hand that had been armed for his protection. Five of the seven were executed in Calcutta for the murder ; and it is probable, that if a criminal court, having jurisdiction over Europeans, had been near the spot where it was committed, six lives would have been saved to the community, and an enormity prevented which must necessarily have produced disgust and horror among the native population of the place." (Fifteen Years in India, pp. 99 and 100).

But the authorities did not do much to remove the grievances of the natives. All that they did, was contained in the section 105 of the Charter Act of 1813. This section empowered magistrates in the provinces to have jurisdiction in cases of assault and trespass committed by British subjects

on natives of India. As said before, this did not go far enough to deter British subjects from oppressing natives.

May it not be that it was the policy of the natives of England to allow a free influx of their countrymen into India so that they might insult, assault and oppress its inhabitants in order to provoke hostilities ? The natives of Great Britain wanted to colonize India. But the East India Company stood in their way. It was not the interest of the Company to encourage the colonization of India by their countrymen. They propagated certain myths as to the unsuitability of India for purposes of colonization. India moreover was a populous country and its inhabitants an industrious people. Before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in his examination as a witness, Sir Thomas Munro was asked :—

“Do you think it possible that any considerable portion of Europeans can maintain themselves in India, so as to colonize that country ?”

In reply he said :—

“The Europeans at present, by law, cannot become proprietors of land in India; they cannot be manufacturers, on account of the superior skill and economy of the natives; they are therefore excluded from almost every other means of subsisting themselves, except by trade; and I therefore conceive that their numbers never could augment so greatly as to make them what might be called a colony.”

Colonization means displacement. Unless the heathen natives were displaced, there could be no room for Christian Europeans to colonize India. This permission of the free influx of the Europeans was the introduction of the thin end of the wedge into Indian politics to accomplish their desired end. There was sure to be friction between Europeans and Indians. Of course, justice was very seldom to be meted out to the latter. Their rising against the Europeans in order to defend themselves from the ill-treatment of the latter would be the justification for Englishmen to crush them. This is not quite hypothetical. This was the tactics adopted by the white Christians in their dealings with the non-Christians all over the world. Scheming and designing as the English people are, there is no wonder if they looked upon the free influx of their compatriots as a means that would lead to the colonization of India. Surely, that would produce the desired effect of the displacement of natives and thus facilitate colonization.

We may look at this question of the free influx of Europeans into India from any point of view we like, but we cannot help coming to the conclusion that it was meant for the benefit of the natives of England, and was certainly not calculated to promote the happiness and comfort of the people of India.

In the letter from Messrs. John Bebb and James Pattison, on behalf of the East India Company, to the Right Hon. George Canning, dated 27th February, 1818, it is stated that the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committees of the two Houses of Parliament, preparatory to the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1813, clearly establish the following propositions:—

“That the natives of India, though, generally speaking, weak in body and timid in spirit, are very susceptible of resentment, and of peculiarly quick sensibility in all that regards their religion and women.

“That Europeans, particularly on their first arrival in India, are occasionally liable, from ignorance, to give involuntary offence to the natives.

“That Englishmen, especially those of the lower order, are addicted to excesses disgusting to the natives, and which frequently lead to acts of violence and outrage; and that, in general, they are prone to domineer over and oppress the natives from a sense of their own personal and national superiority.

“That the natives, if they have not the ready means of obtaining legal redress for the injuries which they sustain, will be disposed to take the law into their own hands.

“That the natives, when aggrieved, will often be deterred from seeking legal redress by the distance of the courts, the expenses attendant upon prosecutions, the difficulty of procuring the attendance of witness, and the delays of judgment.

“That when legal redress is sought for injuries inflicted the affinity of the country, language, manners and dress

of the Judge with those of the person against whom the complaint is lodged, and possibly the social intercourse subsisting between them, will somewhat shake the confidence of the prosecutor in the justice of the sentence, when it does not exactly accord with his wishes and expectations.

"That the frequent punishment of Europeans, although it may give to the administration of justice an air of impartiality, will tend to degrade their character in the eyes of the natives, and greatly diminish the respect in which it has been hitherto held.

"That among the British residents in India there is a strong disposition to assert what they conceive to be their constitutional and indefeasible rights, a general leaning towards each other, and a common jealousy of the authority of Government.

"That an unrestrained ingress of Englishmen into the interior of the country would be productive of the most baneful effects upon the comfort of the inhabitants and the peace of society, and would be fatally injurious to the British name and interests.

"That the number of Europeans who gain admission into the interior, whether clandestinely or from misplaced indulgence on the part of the local Governments, will always be proportioned to the number who are permitted to proceed from England or elsewhere to India.

"That notwithstanding the stipulation which has been introduced into most of the treaties subsisting between the Company and the principal native powers in India, by which the latter have agreed not to engage Europeans in their service without the consent of the Company's Government, it is very probable that inferior chieftains and jaghirdars, and even princes of more note, may employ such persons without its coming to the knowledge

of the Company's residents, and very possible that Europeans may make their way into the native States in spite of all the restraints which can be devised. And lastly.

"That colonization, and even a large indiscriminate resort of British settlers to India, would by gradually lessening the deference and respect in which Europeans are held, tend to shake the opinion entertained by the natives of the superiority of our character, and might excite them to an effort for the subversion and utter extinction of our power."

---



## CHAPTER III.

### THE SETTLEMENT OF EUROPEANS IN INDIA.

"Give them an inch and they will ask for an ell," is a well known saying of the natives of England. They have always tried to act upon it. Ever after the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company, in 1813, in which the natives of England were granted the concession under certain conditions to freely come out to India, they commenced agitating to be further granted the privilege of colonizing India. Although it was mentioned by all the witnesses examined in 1813 before the Committees of both the Houses of Parliament, that the free resort of the British to India would cause oppression and unhappiness to the Indians, yet, in order "to promote the "happiness" of those dusky people, the British were granted, to a certain measure, the concession which they had been clamouring for. But the concession was not deemed sufficient for them. So they commenced agitating for the colonization of India. And unhappily for India, some of the highest Anglo-Indian authorities of those days, lent their support

to this agitation. Thus Sir Charles T. Metcalfe in Minute, dated 19th Feb., 1829, wrote:—

“Concurring cordially in the proposition for extending to Europeans, engaged in the cultivation of indigo, and in other speculations, the privileges already granted to coffee planters, I beg leave to submit my reasons for advocating that proceeding; as I am not quite satisfied with those stated in the Resolution of Government.”

“I have long lamented that our countrymen in India are excluded from the possession of land, and other ordinary rights of peaceable subjects.

“I believe that the existence of these restrictions impedes the prosperity of our Indian Empire, and of course, that their removal would tend to promote it.

“I am also of opinion that their abolition is necessary for that progressive increase of revenue, without which our income cannot keep pace with the continually increasing expense of our establishments.

*“I am further convinced that our possession of India must always be precarious, unless we take root by having an influential portion of the population attached to our Government by common interests and sympathies.*

“Every measure, therefore, which is calculated to facilitate the settlement of our countrymen in India, and to remove the obstructions by which it is impeded, must, I conceive, conduce to the stability of our rule, and to the welfare of the people subject to our dominion.

“The proceeding now adopted being a step forward in what appears to me to be the right course, has my hearty concurrence.”

Lord William Bentinck was also of the same opinion as expressed in his Minute, dated 30th May, 1829.

"The sentiments expressed by Sir Charles Metcalfe have my entire concurrence; and when he adopted the recent Resolution to permit the occupancy of land by Europeans, it was by no means my intention to rest upon that measure as a final one, still less that the grounds assigned for its adoption should be regarded as embracing the general question of the policy to be observed in respect to British settlers. Believing the diffusion of European knowledge and morals among the people of India to be essential to their well being and convinced that the development of the natural resources of the country depends mainly on the introduction of European capital and skill, it has always been my wish and intention that the above question should be fully considered and discussed, and that the result of our inquiries and deliberations should be submitted at an early period to the authorities at home. But the resolution referred to did not seem to require that we should enter upon so wide a field; our immediate purpose was merely to enlarge the operation of certain rules already partially in force, and the effect of our determination will only be to permit that which is now done covertly, to be done openly. \* \*

"We need not, I imagine, use any laboured argument to prove that it would be infinitely advantageous for India to borrow largely in arts and knowledge from England. \* \* Nor will it, I conceive, be doubted that the diffusion of useful knowledge, and its application to the arts and business of life, must be comparatively tardy, unless we add to precept the example of Europeans, mingling familiarly with the natives in the course of their profession, and practically demonstrating by daily recurring evidence the nature and the value of the principles we desire to inculcate, and of the plans we seek to have

adopted. It seems to be almost equally plain, that independently of their influencing the native community in this way, various and important national advantages will result from there being a considerable body of our countrymen, and their descendants, settled in the country. To question it is to deny the superiority which has gained us the dominion of India: it is to doubt whether national character has any effect on national wealth, strength and good Government: it is to shut our eyes to all the perils and difficulties of our situation: it is to hold as nothing community of language, sentiment and interest, between the Government and the governed: it is to disregard the evidence afforded by every corner of the globe in which the British flag is hoisted: it is to tell our merchants and our manufacturers that the habits of a people go for nothing in creating a market, and that enterprise, skill and capital, and the credit which creates capital, are of no avail in the production of commodities.

“\* \* \* \* Is there anywhere the prospect of our obtaining, in a season of exigency, that co-operation which a community, not avowedly hostile, ought to afford to its rulers? Is it not rather true that we are the objects of dislike to the bulk of those classes who possess the influence, courage and vigour of character which would enable them to aid us? Do our institutions contain the seeds of self-improvement? Has it not rather been found that our difficulties increase with length of possession?”

\* \* \* \* \*

“The answers to those questions must, I apprehend, be such as to imply that the present condition of things is far from being that with which we could justifiably sit down contented. They must equally, I am satisfied, be rendered in full sincerity and truth, evince that the required improvement can only be sought through the more

extensive settlement of European British subjects, and their free admission to the possession of landed property."

It was from political considerations that Metcalfe and Bentinck favored the settlement of Europeans in India. This is evident from their Minutes. But it would not have served their purpose to have given out their real reasons for permitting Europeans to settle in India. So they had to use the mask of philanthropy to cover their ulterior designs. It was said that the natives of India would be benefited by the settlement of Europeans and that capital would flow into India to fertilise it. But these advantages were myths pure and simple. Mr. David Hill, on being examined before the Parliamentary Committee on 30th March 1832, was asked:—

"367. You are aware that the idea is entertained by many persons, that the introduction of European settlers into India is not only practicable but would be advantageous; are you able to state to the Committee any general ideas upon that subject?"

In reply, Mr. Hill said:—

"The advantages to arise from the settlement of Europeans in India have been wonderfully exaggerated; I estimate them very low indeed. The process used to go by the name of Colonization; now, I believe, the principle recommendations of the scheme are considered to be the transfer of British capital, and skill and enterprise, for the purposes of drawing forth the resources of India. I have no conception that any British capital would ever find its



way to India: it never did when the temptation was much greater than it can now be expected to be; and the distance of our empire, the uncertain tenure by which we hold it, the alarms continually springing up as to events endangering its stability, will effectually prevent British capitalists from transferring their funds to India. In that case, there remain only the skill and enterprise of Englishmen. According to my conception, they will be very far behind the natives in most departments to which skill can be applied. There are physical difficulties in the way of their undertaking manual labour, which must exclude them from being agriculturists or mechanics in India: for I imagine that a farmer who never held the plough in his hand, and who was transferred to a country where the climate, and the system of agriculture and the products of the earth are all different from what he has been accustomed to, could never cope, in point of skill, with the natives of the country. I imagine that the ryots of India are much better husbandmen than European settlers would be. So it would be as to mechanics also. There remains only the object of stimulating and directing the exertions of the natives themselves: an object which falls very far short of the sanguine expectations of the advocates of the system of free resort of European settlers to India, and an object which, under the present system, seems to me to be attained to its full extent, or under the present system admits of being carried to any further extent which may be deemed necessary. Then there will arise objections to the system connected with the bad characters which would go: if none but good characters went, they would be doing harm to themselves, but would not do any harm to India. A man of good conduct and capacity could not injure India: but my

impression is, that as it would be a bad speculation to the settlers, many would forfeit the good character they took out with them, and many others would find their way to India who were bad subjects, difficult to govern and not capable of conferring any benefits on the country they visited."

The further questions on the subject and the answers which Mr. David Hill gave to them are reproduced below :—

"369. At what period was there more facility or temptation for exporting British capital into the provinces of India than at this moment?—When the rate of profit was much higher than it now is, or is likely ever to be again; when with the greatest ease 20 per cent. might be made in the money market of India, where five or six now is a fair remuneration.

"370. Did not the system of the Company, by impeding Europeans from settling in India, oppose obstructions to the introduction of European capital into that country?—Probably the obstructions to the resort of Europeans may, in some measure, have tended to prevent British capital from being transferred there; but I should think, if the inducements had been sufficient, there were no obstructions that would have been effectual.

"371. Are there now Europeans in the presidencies who, if greater facilities were allowed, would engage in agricultural or manufacturing speculations in the interior of the country?—I am not aware that there are or that there is useful scope for a greater number. I think they would supplant better men in the persons of natives who are now employed in those pursuits.

"372. In point of fact, are there not many Europeans at the presidencies who are calling out for greater

facilities ?—There are a great many more Europeans in India now than can find useful employment.

“373. Are they not cut off from a great variety of the employments of the country? I think not: they are prevented from acquiring real landed property.”

“376. When you say that in some cases Europeans, if allowed to go into the interior, might supplant the natives, how do you reconcile that statement with your former opinion, that the natives generally will be found to cope successfully with the Europeans in regard to the produce of the interior? Still I conceive that through the patronage of their countrymen, connection by blood, or by friendship, or recommendation, they would be preferred to situations that might be more fitly occupied by natives. \* \* There are higher situations which are at present filled by natives that might be transferred to Europeans, through favour shown to them by their countrymen.

“377. WHERE DOES THE CAPITAL EMPLOYED BY THE INDIGO PLANTERS COME FROM?—IT IS ACCUMULATED IN INDIA EXCLUSIVELY.”

Besides Mr. David Hill, several other witnesses stated also that no capital would be brought out from England to India. Thus Mr. W. B. Bayley, in his examination before the Parliamentary Committee on the 16th April 1832, in answer to question No. 919, said :—

“My opinion that no capital will be brought from England into India arises from little or none having been brought hitherto, even at periods when interest has been at a much higher rate than it now is,”

Then he was asked :—

“920. Do you think more capital would not go to India if the restriction on Europeans resorting to India was altogether taken away?—I do not think that capital would be sent from England, but I think that capital which would be otherwise remitted to England would probably remain in India.”

“921. Do you not think that Europeans without capital, persons of broken fortunes and character, might be tempted to go out as adventurers?—That is a mischief to be apprehended : \* \*

Then in answer to a further question he said :—

“Europeans might be guilty of violent, insulting and offensive conduct, which though not perhaps punishable by law, might be extremely irritating and distressing to the natives.”

Captain T. Macan also in his examination on 22nd March, 1832, was asked :—

“1435. Would Europeans be likely to invest their capital in works of that sort?—I think there is much error upon the subject of European capital in India.

“1436. Under the existing law that restricts intercourse with India, is it probable, in your opinion, that any companies would be found to undertake such works?—I think Europeans who have *acquired capital in India*, might undertake such [public] works, with proper encouragement ; but I scarcely can anticipate so much enterprise and risk as to take capital from England to invest in such speculations ; *in truth, capital is, I believe, never taken out of England to India - it is made there and remitted home.*”

It was a myth then that European settlers would bring any capital from England to India. Mr. Rickards truly said in his Evidence before the Commons' Committee on East India affairs in 1830, that :—

“Any improvement which may have arisen in consequence of the introduction of British capital and enterprize into India, is nothing in comparison with what would be the case if the natives were sufficiently encouraged, and proper attention paid to their cultivation and improvement. India requires capital to bring forth her resources ; but *the best and fittest capital for this purpose would be one of native growth*, and such a capital would be created if our institutions did not obstruct it.”\*

He also said :—

“In many branches of art also, their skill is unrivalled ; several of their fabrics, such as muslins, shawls, embroidered silks, and pieces of workmanship in gold, silver and ivory, have never yet been equalled by British artists. In many other arts connected with the comforts and conveniences of life, the natives of India have in some made great progress, and in others attained perfection, without being in the smallest degree indebted to European patterns or examples. \* \* \* \*

“The natives are much given to commercial and industrious pursuits, and exceedingly well qualified to succeed in them. They are sufficiently commercial to

---

\* P. 308, Vol. I. (Public). Appendix to Report from Select Committee on the affairs of the E. I. Coy. Published by order of the House of Commons, 1832.



answer the highest expectations that can be formed, or desired, in respect to trade between the two countries but our local institutions must be greatly altered before they can become wealthy or prosperous : if the condition of the natives. their habits, wants, rights, and interests were properly attended to, all the rest would follow.”\*

Regarding the native capital, Mr. Forbes also said :—

“The native capital is considerable, though it has not been increasing of late years, owing to overtaxation. The natives want encouragement to apply it.”†

According to General Lionel Smith :—

“The native merchants are not so prosperous as they were ; *they WERE very rich.*”§

The Government of India of that period did all it could to prevent the natives of the country from accumulating capital. The land was the principal source of revenue to the Government and so it was very heavily assessed. This is borne out by the evidence of the witnesses examined before the Commons’ Committee on East India Affairs, in 1830. Thus M. Rickards said :—

“Without a suitable reform of the system of taxation, and a better administration of justice, the progress of prosperity among the natives cannot be great. Where the revenue is collected, as it is in India, on the prin-

---

\* Loc. cit. p. 308.

† Loc. cit. p. 306.

§ Loc. cit. p. 308.

ciple of the government being entitled to one-half of the gross produce of the soil, and vast numbers of officers are employed in the realization of it, it is a moral impossibility for any people whatever to live or prosper so as to admit of a very extensive commercial intercourse."

According to Mr. Mill,

"Generally in India more than enough has been collected by the Government from the cultivators; \* \*"

Mr. Bracken said :—

"The large proportion of the gross produce, which the government take from the land, interferes with the rate at which the cultivators of the soil can borrow money."

Mr. Gordon said :—

"The natives of the Coromandel Coast would not be benefited by free trade and settlement, if the same revenue system were enforced. In taking the land tax, as little as possible is left for the subsistence of the people. It is impossible to look for improvement in any way, unless there is a moderate assessment of the land."

Mr. Chaplin said :—

"Almost the only thing to be done to improve the character and condition of the inferior classes, is to lower the assessment, and fix it for a long period. By taking a moderate rent, we shall contribute more to the prosperity of the people, and to the suppression of crime, than by the most perfect code of regulations;\*\*\*"

---

\* Loc. cit. p. 306.

Had the suggestions of the above mentioned witnesses been acted upon there would have been no need of the so-called introduction of foreign capital into India. Permanent Settlement had been granted to Bengal and so, according to Mr. Mill,

“In Bengal there has been a considerable increase of capital and extension of cultivation.”\*

But to increase the prosperity or happiness of the natives of India, was not an object dear to the heart of the authorities. They wanted to increase the number of their own kith and kin in India and so they made use of the pretext that the European settlers would bring capital into this country.

In the Minute of Lord Bentinck, from which extracts have been given above, his lordship expressed his belief that “the diffusion of European knowledge and morals among the people of India” was “essential to their well being.” It was one of his reasons for favoring the settlement of Europeans in this country. But what were the European morals which were held out before the natives to imitate? It was to substitute the luxurious and artificial existence of the Westerners for the plain and simple living of the Indians. It was to make drunkards of sober and abstemious Asiatics.

---

\* *Ibid.*

Mr. Holt Mackenzie, in his evidence before the Commons' Committee, on the 23rd February 1832, said :—

"I believe intercourse with Europeans leads to indulgence in the use of wine and spirits, which, though it may be lamented on the score of morals, must be beneficial to the revenue ; their servants are generally better clothed, and the articles of clothing being subject to taxation, that would increase the revenue. \* \* \* \*

"Judging from Calcutta, there has been, I think a marked tendency among the natives to indulge in English luxuries ; they have well-furnished houses, many wear watches, they are fond of carriages, and are understood to drink wines."

Yes, it gladdened the hearts of many a Christian Anglo-Indian, that the natives had taken to the drinking of wines. In his evidence before the Commons' Committee, on the 24th March 1832, Mr. Bracken said that

"Liquors,\* in Calcutta are now consumed in large quantities by natives who can afford to purchase them."

In answer to another question, the same witness said :—

"I heard from a native shopkeeper in Calcutta, who is one of the largest retail shopkeepers, that his customers for wines, and brandy, and beer, were principally natives.

"1936. What should you say was the favorite wine among the natives?—Champagne.

"1937. Formerly they did not consume any wine?—Very little, I believe.

"1938. Is it not contrary to their religion?—I do not know whether it is contrary to their religion, but it is contrary to their habits ; \* \* It is not done openly, but when done it is a violation of their custom rather than of their religion."

The Christian Anglo-Indians were very glad that the heathens had taken to wine-drinking, because this was 'beneficial to the revenue'! Even Lord Bentinck was jubilant over the change that had come over those who were brought in contact with the Europeans. In the course of the Minute already referred to above, his Lordship wrote ;—

"I need scarcely mention the increasing demand which almost all who possess the means evince, for various articles of convenience and luxury purely European; it is in many cases very remarkable. Even in the celebration of their most sacred festivals a great change is said to be perceptible in Calcutta. Much of what used in old times, to be distributed among beggars and Brahmins is now in many instances devoted to the ostentatious entertainment of Europeans, and generally the amount expended in useless alms is stated to have been greatly curtailed."

What his Lordship considered a change for the better was decidedly a change for the worse. To replace the feeding of the beggars by the "ostentatious entertainment" of the rich White was certainly degradation and demoralization and not improvement of the native character. But then it was the policy of Lord Bentinck and others in high authority to denationalize the aristocracy of



the country and to create a chasm and want of sympathy and good feeling between them and the masses of the people.

Then it was said that the skill of the European settlers would be beneficial to Indian agriculture. Dr. Nathaniel Wallich, Superintendent of the East India Company's Botanic Garden at Calcutta, in his evidence before the Commons' Committee, on 13th August, 1832, was asked:—

"2341. What is your opinion with respect to the general character of the husbandry of Bengal?—I should say, that upon the whole, the husbandry of Bengal has in a great measure been mi-understood by the Europeans out of India. The Bengal husbandry, although in many respects extremely simple, and primeval in its mode and form, yet is not quite so low as people generally suppose it to be; and I have often found that very sudden innovations in them have never led to any good results. I have known, for instance, European iron ploughs introduced into Bengal with a view of superseding the extremely tedious and superficial turning of the ground by a common Bengal plough. But what has been the result? That the soil, which is extremely superficial, which was intended to be torn up, has generally received the admixture of the under soil, which has deteriorated it very much.

"2342. Do you consider that the husbandry is susceptible of any great improvement?—Certainly; but not to so great an extent as is generally imagined: for instance, the rice cultivation, I should think, if we were to live for another thousand years, we should hardly see any improvement in that branch of cultivation. Other cultiva-

tions are more or less susceptible of improvement. but not to that extent, that is generally supposed. The indigo plant, as it is now cultivated, (I do not speak of manufacture) is probably not susceptible of any great improvement."

But even assuming for the sake of argument that the settlement of Europeans in India would have improved agriculture would that have been beneficial to India? This was very well answered by Mr. Thomas Fortescue, who appeared as a witness before the Commons' Committee, on the 17th April, 1832. He said:—

"There is, I believe, a strong opinion in the Indian service in favor of the introduction of Europeans, but it is to be considered whether the improvements in India shall be based upon its institutions or sought for through our own. I think the natives of India are entitled to have their interests favoured in preference to those of this country. I look to the further introduction of Europeans, and the other arrangements that are going on, as tending ultimately to the abolition of the present laws of India, their language and religion too. There is no doubt that the intelligence of the Europeans and their skilful application of capital will very much improve the country at large, and in respect of cultivation and population, but I have great doubts *whether the result of all such improvements will not be vastly on the side of our own country.*"

Yes, by favouring the settlement of Europeans in India, the interests of the children of the soil were intended to be sacrificed for the benefit of the whites.

But the Charter Act of 1813 had sufficiently encouraged the influx of the whites to India. The natives of England however did not consider the provisions of that Act good enough for their purpose. Mr. T. Hyde Villiers, Secretary to the Commissioners for the affairs of India, in his circular letter dated India Boards, February 11th, 1832, included the following question:—

“4. The settlement of Europeans in India. Whether it has of late years been promoted or encouraged. What particular classes of persons should be particularly encouraged to proceed to India. What are the dangers to be guarded against in the admission without licence of British settlers, and under what conditions Europeans should be allowed to settle in India.

Before proceeding to reproduce the replies of some of those to whom the circular letter was addressed, it is necessary to point out the defects in the above questions. It was not sufficient to know what had been done to promote or encourage the settlement of Europeans in India, but also how many natives of India, if any, had been polished off and launched into eternity, assaulted, maltreated and insulted by the European adventurers who had proceeded to India under the provisions of the Charter Act of 1813. The information on this subject should have been elicited by including it in the above questions. But probably it was not the desire of the authorities to protect Indians from the insults and injuries inflicted by the white settlers.

The circular letter above referred to was answered by four gentlemen. The most important reply was that of Mr. Mountstuart Elphinstone. He had risen from the lowest rung of the ladder of the Indian Civil Service to the Governorship of Bombay and so his opinion on the settlement of Europeans in India ought to have carried greater weight than that of any other person. He wrote:—

“I think the establishment of a colony in India would be an evil, because the increased numbers of Europeans, and their more frequent collisions with the natives, would render general those feelings of distinction between the two classes which seem to prevail in all other colonies.

“A much greater evil would be that a colony would draw off the attention of the Legislature from the natives whose interests would never be separately considered, though they would often be directly opposed to those of the colonists. The danger of this undue attention to the European settlers exists even now when there are only 3,000 or 4,000 in all India.

“The unrestricted settlement of Europeans, though not sufficiently numerous to form a colony, would do much harm, from their getting into disputes with the natives, and thus rendering our government unpopular, even if they did not excite open disorders. The manners and habits of the lower orders would also be offensive to the natives, and would increase their dislike to the European character, while it diminished their respect for it.

“They would be turbulent and difficult for the Government to manage. The settlement of Europeans would likewise do much harm, and create much discon-

tent, by supplanting the natives in the middle class of employments. This I should consider the greatest danger of all, if it were not that it might be guarded against as far as the public was concerned by legislative enactments.

"It does not require a very great number of Europeans to produce most of the ill consequences I have stated. Even when I speak of a colony, I do not suppose the present numbers (of 3,000 or 4,000) to be increased tenfold. The formation of such a colony as should be able to make head against a revolt of the natives I consider to be out of the question, both from the nature of the climate, and from the difficulty in finding room for them in a country like India, without pressing so much as to lead to insurrections and to their extirpation before they were strong enough to offer resistance."

Another gentleman whose name is not divulged in the pages of the Report, but who belonged to the Indian Civil Service, in reply to Mr. T. Hyde Villiers, wrote :—

"I am of opinion that the visits of merchants to India are advantageous ; but, *with a view to preserve our Empire there*, no Europeans should be encouraged to settle in India. Without attempting to detail the many reasons which have led me to form this conclusion, I shall merely allude to the following obvious objections :

1. Degeneracy, both moral and physical seems inevitable when the inhabitants of northern climates become resident in tropical regions. \* \* \* \* 2. If English settlers were to obtain offices, it would displace the natives, \* \* for whom there is already so little encouragement. 3. They would probably be of such a class, that there



would be frequent collision between them, and the civil authorities as well as the natives, (which the interior of a camp proves) which would add greatly to the business of the Courts, and prevent the possibility with justice of extending the system of having native instead of English Judges, as has been lately brought to the test of trial. 4. Finally there is not much field left for profitable labour in the present state of the country."

Mr. Sullivan of the Madras and Mr. Warden of the Bombay Civil Service were the two other gentlemen who replied to Mr. Hyde Villiers' circular letter. Both of them were in favour of the free settlement of Europeans in India.

The restrictions on those natives of England who were desirous of proceeding to India were very reasonable.

"When the Court comply with the application of a person wishing to proceed to India, they require him to enter into a regular covenant, with a penalty bond and to sureties, for all of which payment is required. The covenant confines him to a particular town or presidency. The charge on a covenant is 12 £s., of which 7£s.. is for stamps, which would not be required if a simple permission to reside were given. For free merchant's indentures the charge is, £27. 10s.; free mariner's, £9. 10s.

"No British subject can reside in India without a licence from the East India Company; and no British subject, even with a licence, can go beyond 10 miles of the Presidency without a new licence. British subjects having licences are liable to have them cancelled at the discretion of the different governments; and after two



months' notice, to be deemed persons in India without a license. They must be furnished with a fresh license at every removal from district to district. There is no practical inconvenience in this, because the license is never refused; but there is some trouble, and a fee of 32 rupees is attached to each license.

"According to the East India calendar, the number of private British settlers in India was,

	1813.	1830
Bengal	... 1,225	1,707
Madras	... 187	134
Bombay	... 469	308
	1,881	2,149

"Since 1821 the annual number of licenses is nearly doubled. \* \*

"The number of European settlers in Bengal has increased since the opening of the trade. \* \*

"The number of considerable European mercantile establishments at Bombay has, since 1826, increased from 5 to 10 or 12. There are very few British settlers in Bombay.

\*

\*

\*

\*

"Throughout the Madras provinces, there are about 20 British-born subjects not in the Company's service, chiefly shop-keepers. The reason why there are so many more in Bengal is, that the Supreme Government have systematically been favorable to interlopers. The laws against free settlement are more rigorously executed at Madras than at Bengal, and still more so at Bombay. No country officer is allowed to sail out of Bombay without having freemariner indentures; in Calcutta not one in a hundred has them. Regulations with respect to passports are very strict in the Madras territories. British subjects travelling without passports are considered as vagrants.

"British residents are required by regulation to furnish themselves with passports on proceeding into the interior, but the regulation is by no means strictly attended to.

"Persons do get out to India when refused a license by the Court, and reside unmolested. There are many respectable and industrious British subjects now in India without license. Many unlicensed persons reside undisturbed.\*

From the above which is a summary of the evidence of several distinguished witnesses who appeared before the Commons' Committee on East India affairs, in 1830, it is quite clear that the Regulations regarding the resort of Europeans to India were not harsh and did not cause any inconvenience to those who wished to proceed to India to make their fortunes. Yet they agitated for the repeal of these regulations. They complained that

"The inconveniences and obstacles to which the European cultivator in India is subject are many; the prohibition to hold lands, the power of deportation vested in the Government, the state of the administration of justice, and the condition of the police. None can engage in the inland trade of salt, betelnut, tobacco or rice, except on account of the Company; and British subjects are not permitted to hold lands in property, lease or mortgage."†

---

\* Pp. 316-317 of Appendix to Report from Select Committee on the affairs of the East India Company, Vol. 1. (Public) London, 1832.

† Loc. cit. p. 317.

Well, if the whites would not submit to the regulations, which were meant to protect the interests of the dark-skinned people of India, they could have stayed in their own country and need not have come out to India.

It was a wise regulation which prohibited the natives of England from holding land in India. Mr. David Hill, in his examination as a witness before the Commons' Committee on 30th March, 1832, was asked:—

“387. What is your idea with respect to giving Europeans power of holding land in India? I see no possible benefit to accrue from it, and a great deal of embarrassment.

“389. Would a law authorising them to hold land in India produce any positive mischief? According to my apprehension, it would. The English settlers belonging to the ruling party in the state, would have influence enough to have laws framed and executed so as to favor them at the expense of the land-holders, who belong to the conquered part of the community; and in that way I think it would be a serious evil to India, a wrong committed against the natives of that country, and for no advantage, as far as I am aware. They have the fruits of the land as it is; and, considering what physical disadvantages they labour under, and what political evils would ensue from allowing a free resort of Europeans to India, I think nothing would be gained, and only loss would be incurred by changing the law in that respect.”

Equally wise was the regulation authorising the deportation of mischievous Europeans from

India. Regulation III of 1818 was framed in order to deal with the Europeans let loose on India by the peace of 1815. It affected only the bad characters, yet the guilty conscience of the would-be settlers urged its repeal. Mr. N. B. Edmonstone, in his examination before the Commons' Committee on the 16th April, 1832, was asked :—

“1679. In how many cases has the extreme force of the law been called into action during your experience of Indian administration, or during your knowledge of it historically ?—I only recollect five cases;

“1680. Do you conceive that power, the existence of which has been known only in the few cases to which you have called the attention of the Committee, has had any material effect in preventing the ingress of British capital and British enterprise into India, so far as capital and enterprise were required?—No ; I do not think it has had any such effect, nor that it is calculated to have, because no one will go there under the anticipation of placing himself in a situation to incur that penalty.”

So it was a pure myth to say that because there existed the Deportation Law, therefore Englishmen fought shy of bringing their capital to India.

Regarding the state of the administration of justice, and the condition of the police, which were considered to be obstacles to which the European cultivator in India was subject, it is worth while to quote the opinion of Mr. W. B. Bayley, who in

his examination before the Commons' Committee on 16th April, 1832, said:—

"I think that we ought not to legislate with a special regard for Englishmen, and that the natives have a superior claim to consideration in questions of improving our system for the administration of justice in India. At the present moment foreign Europeans, Frenchmen, Dutchmen and Germans, of whom there are many individuals in the interior of our provinces, are subject to our laws and tribunals, civil and criminal, on precisely the same footing as the natives of India, and I have never heard of any serious complaints upon that point; \* \*"

In answer to a further question, he said:—

"I think that of late years those who were desirous of settling there have had little or no difficulty in doing so. The Government of Bengal has rarely, if ever, refused the application (however, contrary to law) of individuals who wished to go into the interior of the country; and the Board of Control have, I believe, granted permission in instances in which it had been refused by the Court of Directors. My opinion that no capital will be brought from England into India arises from little or none having been brought hitherto, even at periods when interest has been at a much higher rate than it now is."

There existed every facility then for those natives of England who wished to settle in India and under the circumstances it is difficult to understand why they were clamoring for more privileges and greater encouragement.

From the manner in which the indigo factors behaved towards the natives of this country, the



authorities should have done everything in their power to discourage Englishmen of that class from coming out to settle in India. The conduct of the indigo planters and factors should have been a warning—an object lesson, to teach the Indian authorities that it was highly undesirable to encourage natives of England to come out to India for purposes of exploitation. Of course, there were apologists for the misconduct of the indigo factors. But those apologists were given to special pleading on behalf of their worthless clients. Thus Mr. Peter Auber in his examination before the Commons' Committee on the 29th March, 1832, was asked :—

“1557. It has been stated as one of the causes why Europeans have borne an inferior reputation in India, that the indigo factories managed by them have been necessarily left to an inferior class of persons, persons not qualified for so great a trust, the persons who own or support such factories not having been allowed to send home for any persons whom they thought likely to be good managers ; can you state to the Committee any and what obstacles now existing which prevent the owners and supporters of indigo factories from sending home for any persons whatever ?”

Of course, Mr. Peter Auber had no difficulty in exposing the fallacies (to use a mild expression) contained in the above question. He answered :—

“I am not aware of any restriction upon individuals who possess indigo manufactories in India from send-



ing home for parties in any way ; and I believe that, with comparatively few exceptions, all applications that have been made in this country by individuals to proceed to India as indigo planters, or to assist in indigo manufactories, have been complied with."

Then he was asked :—

"1558. Has the Court of Directors been in the habit of granting or refusing permission to persons to proceed to India, on their producing any applications from managers or owners of indigo factories in the East, desiring such persons to proceed to India in their employment?—I believe there is a Return before this Committee of the number of licenses granted by the Court of Directors, and it appears by that Return, that of the requests of parties to join indigo planters, from the year 1814 to the year 1831, 106 were granted by the Court of Directors. I think 11 parties were refused, of which 11, four were granted by the Board ; but the number of indigo manufactories in India generally, comprising the whole of the Country from Delhi to Calcutta, is about 899. The number of European proprietors is 119, and of European assistants about 354. The total Europeans connected with those, are 473."

Mr. David Hill, in his examination before the Commons' Committee on the 30th March, 1832, was asked :—

"391. Have many disputes arisen between the indigo planters and the natives?—There are constant disputes.

"392. What is that attributable to?—It is not easy to say ; it seems to me very like the condition of society in Ireland, where the law derives no aid from popular feeling ; there is continual warfare.

"393. Is it owing to the misconduct of the settlers?—That has only an accidental share in it: that is not the root of the evil. It seems to originate in the necessity of making advances to the poor cultivators; and then the produce, which ought to be delivered in return for those advances, is bought up by some inter-loper, and armed parties are taken out to carry it off by force, or repel the intruder. \* \* \*

"395. Has the settlement of the indigo planters been productive of benefit to those portions of India where they are settled?—I have no means of knowing myself, but I have understood it has. The appearance of the country has improved: *I believe the condition of the people has not.*"

Mr. Neil Benjamin Edmonstone examined before the Commons' Committee on the 17th April, 1832, said:—

"It has always appeared to me that the admitting Europeans generally to hold lands as proprietors and renters in that country, would be calculated rather to interfere with and obstruct, than to encourage and promote the interests of the native landholders. \* \* They (Europeans) will become the rivals and competitors of the native landholders, and progressively supplant them in the possession of their lands. \* \* There must be a constant collision between them, as well as between the Europeans themselves and their respective agents and adherents; \* \* \*

"Finding it difficult to describe concisely the facts represented in the extracts which I hold in my hand, I desire to refer to the detailed narrative contained in them, as bearing me out in the statement that I have given. 'As Magistrate of Nuddea, (says Mr. Turnbull) I have had some opportunity of witnessing the

scenes of contention and strife ensuing from the various and conflicting interests to which that competition gave rise. The disorders which then prevailed in that and neighbouring indigo districts have, I believe, nothing abated to the present day, and they are certainly such as to call for the serious interposition of government. From the moment of ploughing the land and sowing the seed, to the season of reaping the crop, the whole district is thrown into a state of ferment; the most daring breaches of the peace are committed in the face of our police officers, and even of the magistrate himself. \* \* \*

"The Magistrate of Dacca says, 'I will not here put on record acts which have come to my knowledge of the open daring violence directed to the destruction of rival factories; but will ask, where is the instance in this part of the country of the native Zemindar, who, unaided by European partners of influence, has erected indigo factories, and successfully carried on the speculation, without being in the end either entirely ruined or obliged to admit his powerful neighbour to share in his concern, or being himself perhaps cast into gaol for standing up in defence of his own rights?' Mr. Ross states, that 'armed men are kept by the planters to enforce the ryots' contracts'; and Mr. Sealy, another officer, speaks of 'the number of affrays that now annually take place for indigo lands, which are invariably attended with severe wounding, and frequently with loss of life, in consequence of the planters entertaining bodies of fighting men for the express purpose of fighting their battles on these occasions.' These are facts, independently of my own observation and reflection, on which my opinion of the inexpediency of admitting Europeans generally as settlers into the interior of the country, is mainly founded. \* \*"

In the face of the facts cited above, no encouragement should have been held out to natives of England to settle in India.

The military aspect of this question of the settlement of the English in India was also discussed by some of the military officers, to whom the following question was put:—

“Whether advantage or disadvantage to the public interests connected with the army might be expected from encouraging the settlement of British subjects in India. \* \*.”

A synopsis of the replies is given in the military volume of the Report from the Select Committee on the affairs of the East India Company in 1832, from which the following extracts are reproduced:—

“Colonel Limond thinks that ‘the introduction of promiscuous settlers by bringing in collision the vices of our country, would be destructive of the impression on the mind of the Native of European superiority and perfection and ultimately, by the increase of that description of offspring, accelerate a crisis yet far distant.’

“Sir John Malcolm observes,—

‘I cannot think that settlers in India would ever fill our ranks with recruits equal to those which are freshly imported from England ; and there is no other mode in which I can contemplate any benefit to the public interests, as connected with the army, from such colonization.’

“Colonel Stannus remarks, that the danger resulting from colonization,—

‘In enabling Native powers to attach Europeans to their service with greater ease than at present, is more of a political than a military question.’ \* \*

“Lieut. Colonel Mayne,—

‘I cannot see how any advantage to the public interests connected with the army, should be expected from encouraging the settlement of Europeans in India. A general colonization would endanger the safety of the Empire. Our strength is in the high opinion the Natives entertain of the European character; weaken that high opinion, and you undermine the foundation of our power.’

“Major Nutt says.—

‘The permanent residence of British subjects in India, I am decidedly of opinion, should rather be discouraged than promoted. It must be recollected that the soil in India is not like that of New South Wales, unappropriated, but, generally speaking, private property, and therefore not at the disposal of Government. It should also be our policy gradually to introduce the Natives of the country into the administration of its affairs, which would never be accomplished, at least amicably, if Europeans were allowed to settle there in any considerable number, as they would naturally look, and soon become clamorous, for the introduction of English laws and an English legislative assembly, to the exclusion or suppression of the Hindoos and Mahomedans. The Anglo-Indians would also desire to have their representatives, and share in the Government, and hence would probably ensue a contest that would be alike fatal to the interests of all, and possibly the existence of two parties out of three.”

Of all the replies given, that of Captain James Grant-Duff, the well-known author of the History



of the Marathas deserved careful consideration. He wrote :—

“The settlement of British subjects in India \* \* is one of deep interest to the welfare of the natives generally, and I cannot see how the British nation could sanction unrestricted intercourse without danger to the permanency of its own dominion, and injustice to the natives—an injustice extending to the infraction of treaties and the usurpation of individual rights.

\* \* \* If we give way to clamour or sophistry on this great question, shall we not justify the character for selfishness with which we shall be branded ; and ultimately lament our weakness in the ruin of a country, which, if we properly support and foster it, will be a mine of unfailing prosperity to Britain.

“I would recommend that the natives themselves be consulted on the subject.

“—I have heard it observed, that our greatest dangers in India are to be apprehended from three causes : first, disaffection of our Native Troops ; second, the increasing number of half-castes ; third, Russian invasion. \* \* \*

“It is, perhaps, absurd to reply to such very shallow assertions as some of these. General disaffection amongst our native troops is only to be dreaded by excitement on the subject of their religious prejudices, or a reduction of their pay. Colonisation is more likely to engender the first than to repress it ; for, if once aroused by injudicious zeal, ill-timed discussions and publications, or any other cause, it is the extreme of folly to suppose the colonists a counterpoise : they might as well talk of extinguishing a conflagration in the forests of the Western Ghauts with a bucket of Thames water, or of smothering the eruption of a volcano by the fire of a blank cartridge.

"As to the second, it is ludicrous to aver, that the inconvenience (for I do not, in a long period, estimate it as a danger) would not, in every view, be increased; and that the evil would not, in fact, be augmented by the colonists themselves, owing to their communion of interests with those East Indians.

"With regard to the third, what revolutions must happen before the many generations of colonists, having of course by various means ejected or bought out the Natives of India from the more productive lands; what time must elapse before they could become the defenders of the banks of the Indus? Moreover, after having admitted all these moral impossibilities, let us advert to the probability, nay certainty, of our European colonists becoming a poor, lank, puny race, inferior both to Natives and half-castes.

"As to an America, as no one at least avows his wish for extirpation, we may suppose they contemplate something rather resembling a Spanish than an English America; but what is there in the condition of that society so desirable? I mean, not in allusion to what they have escaped, but in comparison with what is, or will be, the rule of British India. I say *will be*, because in regard to a more liberal importation of its products to the country, which has ruined its manufactures and is draining its resources, a change *must* be made. It were, indeed barbarous to think otherwise; regardless of minor obstacles it is clearly the bounden duty of Britain to adopt those measures from which must emanate a paramount benefit to the common subjects of its realm. If, as is true, circumstances have left there great interests unrepresented and unprotected, it would be unfair and unmanly, unlike generous and honest England, to permit them to be sacrificed. That statesman adorns the annals of his country,

and places an unfading laurel on his brow, who, after making himself master of the subject, in defiance of short-sighted views and selfish interests, shall successfully advocate and protect the real rights of India's Natives. \* \* \*

"I shall therefore only remark of colonists that, before they become the defenders of the commonwealth, they generally shake off the mother-country. As colonists, so far from standing forth as champions when the existing government is in any real jeopardy, they merely look to the preservation of person and property, and if they can, of laws. Like the passive Hindoo cultivator, they submit their necks to the yoke, on the best terms they can obtain from the victors."

But that the settlement of the English in India was to be encouraged by all means was a foregone conclusion with the authorities, and so all the weighty and reasonable arguments urged against the measure were not paid any attention to. It was also from political motives that they were influenced to favor the scheme of the settlement of the natives of England in India. The minutes of Metcalfe and Bentinck, extracts from which have been given above, support this view. Mr. Holt Mackenzie also in his examination before the Commons' Committee on the 23rd Feb., 1832, said that the European settlers in India

"would be very useful agents of police. They would be centres of information we now want, and would have great influence over those connected with them. They would be bound to us by a common feeling, \* \*."

---

\* P. 12 of Vol. II. (Finance).

The political considerations prevailed, and in the Charter Act of 1833 were added sections 81 and 82, which declared:—

“And be it enacted, that the said Governor-General in Council shall, and he is hereby required, as soon as conveniently may be, to make Laws or Regulations, providing for the prevention or punishment of the illicit entrance into or residence in the said territories of persons not authorized to enter or reside therein.

“And whereas the removal of restrictions on the intercourse of Europeans with the said territories will render it necessary to provide against any mischiefs or dangers that may arise therefrom, be it therefore enacted, that the said Governor-General in Council shall and he is hereby required, by Laws or Regulations, to provide with all convenient speed for the protection of the natives of the said territories from insult and outrage in their persons, religions, or opinions.”

The license being removed, great encouragement was thus given to the settlement in India by the adventurers of England to whose tender mercies the children of the Indian soil were exposed. The increase in the number of crimes against the persons, if not the property, of the people of India by Europeans may be said to date from this period\* and for this state of affairs the poor natives

---

\* In his speech on the Government of India delivered in the House of Commons on the 10th of July, 1833, Macaulay said:—

“Next to the opening of the China trade, Sir, the change most eagerly demanded by the English people was,

of India have to thank to a great measure Bentinck and Metcalfe.

---

---

that the restrictions on the admission of Europeans to India should be removed. In this change there are undoubtedly very great advantages. I cannot deny, however, that the advantages are attended with some danger.

"The danger is that the new comers, belonging to the ruling nation, resembling in colour, in language, in manners, those who hold supreme military and political power, and differing in all these respects from the great mass of the population, may consider themselves a superior class, and may trample on the indigenous race. Hitherto there have been strong restraints on Europeans resident in India. Licenses were not easily obtained. Those residents who were in the service of the Company had obvious motives for conducting themselves with propriety. \* \* Even those who were not in the public service were subject to the formidable power which the Government possessed of banishing them at its pleasure.

"The license of the Government will no longer be necessary to persons who desire to reside in the settled provinces of India. The power of arbitrary deportation is withdrawn. Unless, therefore, we mean to leave the natives exposed to the tyranny and insolence of every profligate adventurer who may visit the East, we must place the European under the same power which legislates for the Hindoo."



## CHAPTER IV.

### THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE IN 1858 ON THE COLONIZATION OF INDIA.

When the East India Company obtained the Dewany of Bengal, Behar and Orissa, they knew that their tenure of the country was not based on conquest and hence they could not set to work to colonize it with their own compatriots and co-religionists; though the policy which they adopted in governing the country—a policy the immediate effect of which was seen in the terrible famine in Bengal in 1770, was well calculated to achieve that end. The American colonists at that time also had not thrown off the British yoke and so there was no surplus population in England to be spared to colonize India.

But it seems that during the regime of Mr. Warren Hastings, the colonization of India was taken into consideration. Two of his counsellors were strongly opposed to it. That foresighted statesman, Sir Phillip Francis, in his Minute published in the Bengal Revenue Consultations, dated 12th May, 1775, wrote:—

"1. If nothing but grants of waste lands were in question, it would still be an object of serious considera-

tion, *first, to the British Government, whether or not it would be advisable to encourage colonization here.*

"4. The soil of right belongs to the natives. Former conquerors contented themselves with exacting a tribute from the lands, and left the natives in quiet possession of them.

"To alienate them in favor of strangers may be found a dangerous as well as an unjust measure. We cannot understand the arts of cultivation in this soil and climate, so well as the natives. The landholder will consider us with jealousy and hatred, as the invaders of his rights and property. The ryots, attached by custom, religion and prejudice, to the authority of their ancient masters will not readily submit to labour for new ones, to whom they are not bound by any natural relation of manners or religion, or by reciprocal obligations of protection and dependence. A few Europeans will be thinly scattered over the face of the country; the native inhabitants will desert it."

Again, in an introduction to a publication, intitled "Original Minutes of the Governor-General and Council of Fort William, on the settlement and collection of the Revenues of Bengal, with a plan recommended to the Court of Directors in January, 1776," Sir P. Francis wrote:—

*"As a question at least it deserves to be considered whether it may not be essential, not only to the internal prosperity of the country, but to its dependence on Great Britain, that the Europeans in Bengal, should be limited to as small a number as the services of the Government will admit of.*

"The acquisition was made, and has hitherto been

preserved by a British force which has borne no proportion to that of the natives. Under a mild and equitable Government, under such a one as it is our own greatest interests no less than our duty to give them, they are incapable of rebellion or defection. Their patience and submission to their rulers in the last twenty years are sufficient to show how much they can endure. *On the other hand, as we increase the number of those who can only exist at the expense of the country, we load our Government with useless weights, and add to its embarrassments without adding to its strength.*

"Whether these Europeans are directly employed or not in the service of Government, there is no fund but the public revenue out of which they can derive a subsistence. One way or other it is paid for by the country, and one way or other must become chargeable to Government.

"Exclusive of public employments or contracts with the India Company, there is no fair occupation for the industry of Europeans in Bengal. Every enterprise they engage in, whether of foreign commerce or internal improvement, leads them into distress if it does not end in their ruin. Even of adventurers pursuing every mode of acquisition that offers, very few, if any, have succeeded. But these are people to whom no encouragement should be given. *Their residence in the country, especially in the remoter parts, harasses the people and alienates them from their natural habits of submission to any power that protects them.*"

Mr. Monson, another member of Mr. Warren Hastings's Council, wrote:—

"The question now before the Board, on which I am

required to give an opinion, may be considered in a political view:

1st. *Whether it is for the interest of Great Britain to colonize in East India.*

2nd. *Whether such a colony would be of advantage to the India Company.*

"The migrations to countries believed to be the regions of wealth would be so considerable, that the mother country would soon feel the dire consequences of them.

"Every person who comes into this country is impressed with the idea of making in a short time, a very considerable independent fortune."

"The means to be pursued for this end operate to the impoverishment and destruction of the country. If Europeans were allowed to hold farms, as their influence is great, they would in some degree oppress the natives,.....

"Their manner of life will not permit them to give equal profits to the Government with the natives, as their expense on every article of subsistence is more considerable; consequently, the Europeans will be in a worse condition than the natives, or Government must be satisfied with a less revenue from the lands in order to enable them to live.

"The few wants of the natives, who are satisfied with the mere necessities of life, will allow them to pay larger taxes to Government from the same quantity of land, in the same state of culture, than an European can afford to do; it is evident, therefore, that it cannot be for the interests of the Company to allow Europeans to become landholders.

"The uncultivated lands, under a mild and fixed Government might soon be brought into culture by giving premiums and making advances of money to the natives.

"Providence had ordained, by her formation of the

constitution of Europeans, that they should not become the cultivators of this country; they can only be task-masters, and will enrich themselves, having no permanent interests here, to the prejudice of the natives, and to the loss of Government."

Marquis Cornwallis in the course of a letter to Mr. Dundas, dated London, 7th Nov. 1794, wrote:—

"And I am strongly impressed with a conviction that *it will be of essential importance to the interests of Britain, that Europeans should be discouraged and prevented as much as possible from colonizing and settling in our possessions of India.*"

At a Court of Directors held on Wednesday, the 4th February 1801, the following resolutions were read and the Court approved thereof:—

"Resolution Second. That it is equally the interests of the nation, and the duty of the Company, to guard against all principles and measures which, by an indefinite enlargement of the present channel of communication, in their nature tend to the introduction, immediate or gradual, of such an open intercourse, and its probable consequent colonization.

Eleventh. That if to this aggregate capital, which may be termed the present maximum of the native stock of British India for a trade to Europe, it became a practice to add capital belonging to private residents in Great Britain, and transplanted to India for the purpose of forcing the productions of that country beyond the ability of its own means, this would be the introduction of one of the first principles of the Colonial or West Indian system; and if it were sanctioned, directly or impliedly by any public regulation, it would tend greatly to extend



the relations and intercourses between those countries, and this, as well as to supersede covertly, if not openly, the prohibitions to Europeans to occupy lands there which prohibition is already in a variety of instances, dispensed with; and thus, without any certainty of ultimate commercial benefit to the British Empire at large, a change would be commenced in the present system of Indian policy, which is allowed to be the best for the maintenance of those distant possessions."

But with the free influx of Europeans permitted by the Charter Act of 1813, and the annexation of the mountainous tracts both of the Himalayan and the Deccan ranges, some people of England set on foot an agitation for the colonization of India. But to cover their ulterior designs, the agitators had to wear the mask of philanthropy. In a pamphlet entitled "A View of the Present State and Future Prospects of the Free Trade and Colonization of India." The reputed author of which was one Mr. Crawford, it is stated that:—

"Although there may be no room for colonization, there is an ample room for settlement, in a country of fertile soil, far more thinly peopled, after all, than any part of Europe, and a *country without capital, knowledge, morals, or enterprise*.....Our countrymen, living amongst them, will instruct them in arts, in science, and in morals; the wealth and resources of the country will be improved; the Hindus will rise in the scale of civilization.....

He concluded this pamphlet thus :—

"We repeat, that the only suitable and efficient means

of improving our conquered subjects—the only means by which one people ever conferred lasting and solid improvement upon another is a free and unshackled intercourse between the two parties.”

Colonization was advocated on the score of philanthropy, because this, it was said, would lead to the improvement of the natives. What the consequences would have been, if India had been colonised at that time, is all a matter of conjecture; they might or might not have been good for the Indians. In other parts of the world, as a matter of fact, the results have not been good for the natives. The reasons will be clear from what Huxley has written.

“The process of colonization presents analogies to the formation of a garden... (The colonists) set up a new Flora and Fauna and a *new variety of mankind* within the old state of nature. Considered as a whole, the colony is a composite unit introduced into the old state of nature; and, thenceforward, a competitor in the struggle for existence to conquer or be vanquished. (Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics and other Essays*, Vol. IX, p. 16).

“.....(The colonist) would, as far as possible, put a stop to the influence of external competition by thoroughly extirpating and excluding the native rivals, .....the obstacles to the full development of the capacities of the colonists...would be removed by the creation of artificial conditions of existence of a more favourable character.” *Ibid.*, p. 18)

The Natives of India being more civilized and numerous than the natives of the colonies, the re-

sults here would not probably have been exactly the same.

Mr. Frederick Shore was also an advocate of the colonization of India. In his "Notes on Indian Affairs", he treats of the subject at some length and tries to meet the arguments of those who were opposed to it. According to him, the arguments advanced against colonization were:—

"1st. That the rich settlers would supplant the natives in the possession of the soil;

"2nd. That were the country overrun with the lower class of Europeans they would ill-treat the natives, and, from their irregular and disorderly habits, commit many crimes.....;

"3rdly. That as soon as India was tolerably well-peopled with English settlers, it would become independent of the mother-country."

After disposing of the first two objections, he has devoted some considerable space to the consideration of the third. Referring to this, he writes:—

"It is indeed probable that, in the course of time, India will emancipate itself from England,... The probability is, that India will be independent of England long before that event could be produced by colonization; and that, so far from being a means of accelerating that catastrophe, it would rather retard it.....But there are other consequences which would ensue from colonization, whose operation would be more immediately felt by the existing directors of the Indian administration, and it is the

apprehension of these which forms the true reason of the strenuous opposition hitherto made against colonization.

"These are, first, that the present oppressive system of Government towards the natives would be exposed by the new settlers. The people of India are obliged to bear it, as they possess no means of averting it, or making their complaints known: but Englishmen would not submit so quietly: they would at least make themselves heard in England, where public opinion would demand an alteration in the system."

"Secondly, that, before long it would be found absolutely necessary to appoint residents in India to many situations from which they are now excluded: and this would diminish the patronage of the home authorities."

He favored colonization on the ground that—

"Such a body of settlers, having everything to lose, and nothing to gain, by the subversion of the British power, would, in the event of any disturbance or insurrection, exert all their influence, and induce their native dependents and connections to do the same, in support of Government; so different is the feeling of the natives towards the British authority, that when a disturbance arises, those who do not take part in it stand aloof, and will rarely give any assistance to the Government."

Sir Charles Metcalfe and Lord William Bentinck used arguments similar to the above in favor of the settlement and colonization of their compatriots in India.

It was no wonder then that the Charter Act of 1833 afforded greater facilities to Europeans desirous of settling and colonising in India. In fact,

that Act encouraged the colonization of India by Europeans.

Mr. Brian Houghton Hodgson, the well-known Resident of Nepal, was a great advocate of the colonization of the Himalayas by Europeans. His paper written in December 1856 is a very important contribution to the literature on this subject. He wrote:—

“I say, then, unhesitatingly, that the Himalaya generally is very well calculated for the settlement of Europeans, and I feel more convinced, that the encouragement of colonization therein is one of the highest and most important duties of the Government.

“I trust therefore, that the general subject of the high capabilities of the climate and soil of the Himalayas and there eminent fitness for European colonization having once been taken up, will never be dropped till colonization is a, *‘fait accompli,’* and that the accomplishment of this greatest, surest, soundest, and simplest of all political measures for the stabilisation of the British power in India, may adorn the annals of Lord Canning’s administration.

“A word as to the native population, in relation to the measure under contemplation. In the first place, the vast extent of unoccupied land would free the Government from the necessity of providing against wrongful displacement; and, in the second place, the erect spirit and freedom from disqualifying prejudices, proper to the Himalayan population, would at once make their protection from European oppression easy, and would render them readily subservient under the direction of



European energy and skill to the more effectual drawing forth of the natural resources of the region."

In concluding his paper he wrote that—he would encourage "the starving peasantry of Ireland and of the Scotch Highlands to colonize the Himalayas"—

"By free grants for the first five years, and by a very light rent upon long and fixed leases thereafter, looking to compensation in the general prestige of their known forthcomingness on the spot, and assured that, with the actual backing upon occasions of political stress and difficulty of some fifty to one hundred thousand loyal hearts and stalwart bodies of Saxon mould, our Empire in India might safely defy the world in arms against it."

In a foot note, Mr. Hodgson added:—

"To ward off Russian power and influence, we are just now entering on a war (in Persia) as immediately and immensely costly, as full of perplexities and difficulties, even in any of its better issues. Were one-tenth, nay, one-fifteenth, of the money which that war, if it last, will cost, bestowed on the encouragement of European settlements in the Himalaya, we might thus provide a far more durable safe and cheap barrier against Russian aggression, and should soon reduce her land-borne commerce with Eastern Asia to *Nil*."

The far-seeing statesmanship of Francis, Monson, Cornwallis and others who helped to lay the foundation of the British Empire in India was at a discount and the opinions of men like Crawford, Frederick Shore, Metcalfe, Bentinck and Hodgson found favor with the people of England.

Although the authorities never openly gave countenance to colonization, yet after the out-break of the Sepoy Revolt of 1857, the colonization of India was loudly called for by the people of England. An English journalist wrote :—

“Time has brought most people now-a-days to the opinion that the great Mutiny was in a great measure the result of a vicious system, maintained for years, by which India was held as an appanage of the Civil Service. The immigration into India of independent Europeans, who would, if admitted, have taken root in the country, and who might even by mere numbers have prevented the rising, was discouraged and almost prohibited. The result was that the governing class—the Covenanted Civil Service—formed the only avenue to anything like power or distinction ; it gradually absorbed the control of the army as well as the civil administration of the country, and it broke down at once and utterly in the time of trial.”\*

The colonization of India was being loudly demanded by the people of England. Thus wrote Sir Edward Sullivan, Baronet :—

“Every nation, without exception, that has hitherto reduced another to permanent subjection, has, more or less, cemented conquest by colonization :.....and it is an undoubted fact that, in proportion to the number and strength of these colonies, their rule was more powerful and more enduring.

“It would almost appear as if colonization is the only condition on which Providence will permit the substi-

---

\* The Saturday Review for Jan. 29, 1876, p. 146.

tution or lengthened subjugation of one race by another : and as far as history hitherto instructs us, permanent conquest is but another word for vigorous and successful colonization. Up to this period England has in no degree colonized India, or encouraged an amalgamation of races : nor is there any probability, not to say possibility of her doing so.”—Sullivan’s *Letters on India*, 1858, pp. 24-25.

It seems that all the enactments made to encourage the settlement of the English were not enough to induce them to colonize India. Hence special measures were to be adopted to convert India into a colony of England.

The outbreak of the Indian Mutiny in 1857, showed the stay at home residents of England that the Empire which their co-religionists and compatriots had built up in the East was not safe in the hands of the “society of adventurers” who were, by the constitution of that society, not “gentlemen”. The raising of the fabric of that Empire did not cost the natives of Great Britain any expense in money or blood ; but on the other hand it provided them with markets for the productions of their factories and workshops and also afforded careers for their boys. It was the happy hunting ground for the failures of England. India was looked upon as the “milch cow” of that Christian land.

Of course, the Englishmen were not found of

the Empire which Clive and others had founded by means regarding which the less said the better. But the threatened deprivation of their "milch cow" meant starvation and ruin to many millions of people in Great Britain.

To quote the above-named author again—

"India opens out an almost exhaustless field for the educated labour of Great Britain, or in other words, it maintains at a higher level than that existing in any other country, the reward of the labour of educated men.

".....to men who weigh well the crowded condition of every outlet for educated labour in this country, and remember how dangerous to a State the want and desperation of the educated unemployed has always been, it will appear an ample reason for striving to the utmost to retain if not all, at least a very sufficient portion of our Indian possessions. It is not use of hyperbole to say that the marked tranquility of England, when all Europe was tottering, was owing, not a little, to the outlet India had given to her educated of masses",—letters on India, p. 29.

"..... for fifty or sixty years India has been to the brains and intellect of this country what the Western States have been to the thew and sinew of America the safety-valve that has yearly afforded an escapement for the surplus energy or ambition of our educated population. There is no mob, however numerous and violent, half so dangerous as an educated middling class, irritated with want, and conscious of deserving more than the crush and competition of the multitude enable them to acquire.

"If we consider the price that is paid for educated

labour in India, we shall see that it is at least twice as high as that existing in any other country."—*Ibid.*, pp. 51-52.

The threatened destruction of the "milch cow" made the Christian natives of England take interest in Indian affairs. That roused them from their apathy. To quote a contemporary publication of that time.\*

"The memorable year just past has wrought many a sad and startling change, and has laid the foundation of many a wholesome and salutary reform. But, of all the changes it has wrought, and all the reforms it has founded, there is perhaps none so remarkable in its character, as the revolution it has effected in public opinion—or we should more correctly say, in public sentiment—quoad matters Indian. To persons who have mourned and marvelled over the singular indifference hitherto manifested by the English nation to its mighty empire in the East, it is at once curious and instructive now to note the workings of the public mind, on both sides of the ocean, with reference to the great question of India. That little word, but lately the dinner-bell of the house, and the bugbear of general society at home, now rivals in absorbing interest of the dinner-bell itself "the tocsin of the soul." It arrests the eye on every broad sheet; it is the burthen of every speech, or song or sermon. And it would seem to be exhorting an example, if tardy, compensation for the unmerited apathy of years, by the thrilling interest it has now albeit by such sinister and doleful means, at length succeeded in awakening. Curiosity is now fairly agog on this late

---

\* The *Calcutta Review*, Vol. XXX pp. 355-356.



slighted topic. Speculation is rife on its every branch. And declamation is positively rampant on each and every aspect of it.

Both in England and in India, the public attention appears to be thoroughly aroused to the importance and the interest of the great problems now about to be laid before it, in the consideration of the future Government of India. And it is a favourable omen of the earnestness and impartiality which will be brought to the discussion of this complex question, that the people of England would seem to have seriously taken it in hand, that the insouciance of a century on Indian questions has at length given place to a vigilant and wakeful interest, and that the various bearings of this great subject are being thoroughly and popularly ventilated. In this we recognize with joy the first, and best, great result of the agonies of 1857, a parent and our turient result, pregnant with the happiest consequences for the future well-being of this country. The English people has been lasted into a recognition of the interests of India, and stung to a participation in every question affecting its administration."

Wise men amongst them put their heads together to devise ways and means to consolidate the Christian Power in India. The first thing they thought of doing was to abolish the East India Company. How the burial of that body without even a decent funeral was effected has been narrated in the concluding volume of *Rise of the Christian Power in India*.

To keep India always under the iron heels of England, they thought it necessary to transplant

the English language, English religion, English laws, and English customs and manners into India. It was therefore that the question of the colonization of India was being very seriously considered. A Parliamentary Committee consisting of members selected from both the houses was appointed to take evidence and report on the subject.

Colonization means displacement. How the Christian nations of Europe colonised America, South Africa and Australia should be borne in mind. After the discovery of America, the Spaniards showed the way of Christian colonization. They were the pioneers in this enterprise. Readers of Prescott's conquest of Mexico and conquest of Peru know the manner in which the non-Christian Mexicans and Peruvians were exterminated by the Christian Spaniards.

The Spaniards were Roman Catholic Christians and so confessed the atrocities they perpetrated on the helpless and hapless natives whose great fault consisted in their hospitably entertaining the Christian visitors to their lands. But the atrocities of Christians of the Protestant persuasion perpetrated on the natives of North America, South Africa and Australia—on the Red Indians, Zulus, Kaffirs and Maoris, were much worse than those of the Spaniards.

When the natives of England were talking of colonising India, they had certainly in mind the

adoption of the same methods which had proved so successful in the hands of their co-religionists in the New and the Dark continents as well as in Australia in planting their colonies.

It should be remembered that the Indian Mutiny of 1857 did not originate the idea of the colonization of India in the minds of the natives of England. As said before, some eight decades previous to that outbreak—during the administration of Warren Hastings, the colonization of India attracted the attention of some of the officials, and ever since then it was not lost sight of by the Christian administrators of India. But it was the Indian Mutiny which made the people of England seriously consider the subject. They influenced the Parliament to bestow attention on it, and as said above, a Parliamentary Committee was appointed to report. On the 16th March, 1858, it was ordered by the House of Commons—

“That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the progress and prospects, and the best means to be adopted for the promotion of European colonization and settlement in India, especially in the Hill Districts and healthier climates of that country: as well as for the extension of our Commerce with Central Asia.”

This Committee submitted five Reports of the Minutes of Evidence but it came to an end on

the sudden dissolution of the Parliament in April 1859. On the formation of the New Parliament, a fresh Committee was appointed which made its final report on the 9th of August, 1859.

It was not feasible to colonize India in the same manner as had been effected by Christians in other lands. What the obstacles to colonization in India were, was very forcibly and lucidly stated in an article in the *Calcutta Review* for March 1858 (pp. 163—188). The author of the article wrote:—

“The advocates of colonization promise to us, as one of the most valuable and substantial fruits of the measure, that by means of it, we should, in all future times, have at our command a hardy race of trusty Anglo-Saxons (query Indo-Saxons) to assist us in our hour of need; a vigorous European element in the population, acting, or prepared to act, as a bulwark to our power; and ready to rally round our institutions, on the first signal of alarm.”

Regarding this, the writer exclaimed:—

“Delusive supposition! It needs but small reflection to discover the utter fallaciousness of any such hope. Assuming that the experiment were ever tried; assuming that a sort of dismal success attended it; and that the poor, drooping, effete stock lived, and bred, and multiplied indefinitely. Behold them in the fifth remove! Who would recognise in those sallow scarecrows the hardy children of the North? That dull, unmeaning glance, that flabby arm, that sneaking hang-dog gait and carriage, that ‘chee-chee’ mongrel speech! And oh,

worse a thousand times than mere physical debasement, that prostrate reptile spirit, that double face, that coward lying tongue! Are these all the traces left to us of the fire, the courage, the candour, the moral, and physical *fibre* of our vaunted race?...

'Approach, thou craven crouching slave, say, is not this'...the colony!

And these are the sturdy colonists, who, in time of need, are to rally round the throne, and, in time of peace, to imbue India's dusky and degenerate millions with the energy, the probity, the arts, and the virtues of Britain."

Then, turning to the question of planting English colonies in the Indian hills, the writer said:—

"It is doubtless very possible that our English stock, transplanted to the higher plateaus of the Himalaya or the Neilgherries, might thrive tolerably well, in a mere physical point of view...that is, that after a series of generations, they might still present the appearance of a tolerably vigorous and comely race. This we say might be considered as very possible: although we are assuredly not in a position positively to enunciate it. There is, doubtless, much to countenance and colour the assumption; still in the present state of our experience, it is an assumption: and some might feel indisposed to let it pass altogether unchallenged. ....

"Nevertheless, waiving all difficulty on this head, and conceding the possibility that our race would thrive in a physical and bodily point of view, in the Himalayan region; dare we hope for an equal degree of intellectual and social welfare? We fear not.....

"It might almost be predicated as an axiom, that a



colony, to be successful, should have a sea-board...and the more extensive that sea-board the better for the colony. ....

"The ocean is the best nurse of social infants, and without her life-giving contact, there can be little hope of a vigorous or healthy progress in the society.....

"Our Himalayan colonies would resemble the happy valley of Rasselas...Stagnation their bane; they would be stifled for very want of air; and never could attain to any respectable character and dimensions."

Then the writer adverted to another great obstacle to the clonization of India by his countrymen. He wrote

"If climate, soil, and situation were, as they are surely not, favourable, to the enterprise, there would remain this, perhaps the most formidable, the most insuperable difficulty of all—climate might possibly be braved—soil might be subdued and ameliorated—the barriers of situation might be overleaped—railways, canals, and navigable rivers might materially contribute to their removal. But, when all these difficulties had faded and vanished, before the energy and courage of our race, there would still remain the most hopeless, and insurmountable obstacles of all.

"The experience of later ages has demonstrated that there exists a singular and mysterious antipathy and antagonism between the black man and the white. Nor is this a mere antipathy of sentiments; or a simple antagonism of aims, and interests, and customs. These might be softened and overcome. The phenomenon in question lies far deeper; at a depth, indeed, seemingly beyond our reach. A mutual incompatibility of co-existence—an elemental and constitutional antagonism,

which seems to forbid that the two races should co-exist, commix, and flourish together, under the same social laws, and physical conditions. It would appear as if some great natural law forbade the fusion and union of the two. Their destinies would seem incapable of marching side by side, *pari passu*, in the economy of our globe. Where the two races are thrown together in the same arena, the one, it would appear, must over-ride the other; social equality and social fusion there can be none."

... ..

"No, a tropical region, with a dense coloured population, is no theatre for European colonising efforts properly so-called.

"*A colony has no business in an old and populous country.* .....It should stand or fall by its own efforts, be supported by its own honest and productive toil, not be propped up on the shoulders of a subject race. India is not a colony, and never can be a colony, and affords no standing ground for a colony. India is not a colony, but a *conquest*."

Regarding the "*ethnological difficulty*," he wrote:—

"The unmistakable hand of nature having separated and dissociated the black race from the white, terrible and portentous effects might be expected to flow from their unnatural union.....The disastrous union of these two antagonistic stocks could never be effectually prevented; and in a very few years, our hopeless colonies, if in existence at all, would be soon peopled with a race of Europeans of the type of the Goa Portuguese—a degenerate, debased, and hybrid product of the two races, possessing the good qualities of neither."

The writer referred thus to the political obstacles to colonization :—

“In the event of this experiment being attempted not only would very considerable embarrassment be caused by the peculiar land tenures of India, but the statesman would find a knotty point to solve in the consideration of the constitutional and civil right to be conferred upon English colonists in this country ; the peculiar privileges and immunities they should enjoy, and generally, the form of government under which they should be settled.

“It cannot be supposed that any colony of Englishmen could be induced to embody itself under the despotism—a mild despotism it may be—still the despotism of the Anglo-Indian Government. It cannot for a moment be supposed that English colonies would place themselves under the operation of a ‘Black Act,’ or submit to a uniform legislation, in common with the natives of the country. It can never be imagined that they would consent to entrust their interests, their liberties, their lives to the tender mercies of our magistrates, collectors, and deputy commissioners, or commit their fortunes to the dispensations of our mofussil law, and the hand-to-mouth jurisprudence of our provincial Courts.”

The writer spoke the truth when he said :—

“The British have never been invaders of India, in the conventional and accepted sense of the term. Commencing as timid and suppliant traders and subsequently urged on by the irresistible force of circumstances or destiny, ever deprecating, or affecting to deprecate, our own aggrandisement, or the coercion in any respect of the people we have neither been sufficiently numer-

ous in our body, nor sufficiently propagandists in our principles, to effect any great changes in the habits, or the religion, much less the speech, of the inhabitants."

Such were the obstacles at that time to the colonization of India by the Christians of England. So the Parliamentary Committee reported on the 9th of August, 1859, that they

"think it proper to commence their report, by a restriction, obvious to almost every one, of the sense in which colonization must be applied in India. Though sanctioned in its application to that country by modern usage, and by such high authority as that of Lord Metcalfe, the term 'Colonisation' must, in this instance, clearly be limited to a class of superior settlers, who may, by their enterprise, capital, and science, set in motion the labor, and develop the resources of India."

The Committee go on to remark, that

"the inducements to a settlement of the working classes of the British Isles are not generally to be found in India. Those inducements are high wages, the facility of obtaining land at an easy rate, the enjoyment of a constitution framed after that of the mother-country, a temperate climate, and the prospect of forming a part of a community speaking our language and conforming to our manners and customs. The settlement of India took place at a period of remote antiquity. Its lands have mostly been appropriated; the wages of labor are low; its government is absolute; its climate is generally unfavorable to the permanent residence and increase of the British race, and to labor in the open air; and its usages, languages, and religions are strange and repulsive to the English laborer. For these reasons, and in accordance with the testimony laid before them, your

Committee are of opinion, that India cannot compete with the boundless regions of America or Australia as a home for the laboring emigrant."

Although the Committee's report disappointed the enthusiasts for colonization, it was received with a sigh of relief by the sober-minded people of England. Wrote the *Calcutta Review* for March, 1860, p. 17 :—

"We are grateful to those who have, by such plain-speaking, saved us from the prospect which the assertions of a class of writers, who sought safety from a repetition of the horrors of 1857 in planting British communities here and there throughout India, threatened, if uncontradicted, to present to us, of deluded English villagers burying their hopes and children under the jungle miasma of Bengal or the fierce hot winds of the Upper Provinces."

Towards the closing days of November, 1907, the following telegram was to be seen in the papers of most of the countries of the world :—

Prince Buelow has introduced a bill in the Reichstag, for a grant of further £20,000,000 to continue the Germanization of the Polish provinces by means of German settlers, and conferring powers of compulsory ex-propriation.

(*Reuter's Service.*) London, Tuesday. (Novr. 26, 1907).

England could have done the same thing for the English settlers in India as Germany did for the Germanization of Poland. In fact, Mr. Hodgson had suggested the adoption of such a measure.



But the members of the Committee on Colonization above referred to, could not recommend such a procedure. None of the witnesses who appeared before the above Committee even suggested such a course. But, as usual with the Anglo-Indian authorities, they were encouraging Englishmen to settle in India by pecuniary aids from the money taken from the Indian tax-payer. India was expected and made to a certain degree to pay for her being converted into an English colony.

Take, for instance, the case of tea-plantations. How the tea-planters were assisted in this industry will be evident from the following questions put to, and the answers given to them by Mr. J. Freeman, who appeared as a witness before the Select Committee on colonization.

"1922. Are you not aware that both in Assam and Kumaon the Government established tea-plantations for the express purpose of trying experiments for the sake of the settlers, and with the avowed object of handing over their plantations to the settlers as soon as the experiment had been shown to be successful, and as soon as settlers could be found willing to take them?—That is what I refer to; that in the first mootings of the cultivation of tea the Government took the initiative and encouraged it, and went to some expense in taking the necessary steps towards it. Then some Europeans took it up on a large scale, and that attempt was not successful; but somewhere about 14 years ago, in consequence of this new arrangement, where the Government gave them more favourable terms about the land that they

were to concede to them, from that arose the present company, *which has carried it out in a very extensive way, which without the English settlers and their capital I doubt would ever (have) been effected.*

"1923. Did not the Government in fact bear the whole of the expense of the experiment, and hand over, both in Assam and Kumaon, their plantations to the settlers on very liberal terms? That I am unacquainted with; I will not say that it was so or that it was not so.

"1924. Did not the Government send Mr. Fortune, and others before him into China to get seed, and to get tea-markers, Chinese, and otherwise, to inform them as to the Chinese system of culture, for the express purpose and sole object of instructing the settlers in India?—I do not know for certain whether that experiment was made by the Government; I believed it was so ; but I know that Chinamen were brought in the first instance. It was hoped, through them, that the natives in India would get an insight into the cultivation of tea, but it failed, so far."

Thus it will be seen how the European tea-planters have been benefited at the expense of the natives of India. But the Government have never done anything to encourage any purely Indian concern as they have done the tea industry carried on by Anglo-Indians. The fling at the natives of the country by the witness, which we have italicized in the above extract, is quite senseless, for no native has ever been encouraged in the same manner as the European settlers.

It is for the benefit of the European tea-planter,

that that Act, up to this day, stands on the pages of the Indian Statute Book—an Act which the late Hon'ble Rai Bahadur Kristo Das Paul, C.I.E., was compelled to condemn as legalising slavery in India.

The Indian Government very generously offered to assist the iron manufacturers of England if some of them were to come to settle in India. Thus the same writness was asked:—

"1927. Are you aware that the Government have recently sent out a gentleman conversant with the iron manufacture, and with him several assistants, to the province of Kumaon, to introduce the iron manufacture there?—I have read of it, but we offered to do everything at our own expense."

"1928. And the Government have stated that, as soon as the experiment is shown to be successful, they are willing to hand over the works to any Englishman that will undertake them?—Yes, that may be,....."

Comments on the above are superfluous. Again from time to time Indigo-planters have received pecuniary aids from Government at the expense of the Indian tax-payer.

If the Indian Government spent money in building roads and railways in India, these seem to have been made with, among others, the object as set forth by one Mr. J. Dalrymple who appeared as a witness before the aforesaid Committee. He was asked:—

"3551. And with more perfect laws, and the facility

of roads, canals, and rivers, you yourself know of no other place where better fruits for enterprise exist than in Bengal? Certainly not.

"3552. In your long experience you have realized those results? Yes."

Facilities of communication seem to have been made to help colonization. Thus one Mr. W. Theobald was asked:—

"867. Increasing communication and increasing commerce, therefore, will greatly increase the hold of England upon India? Yes, I think so."

Facilities of communication with England have resulted in saddling India with a large increase of English Civil and Military officers and other classes of English officials, for many more are required to do the work of those who are absent on leave. The above-named witness was asked:—

"1278. Do you not think the facilities that have hitherto existed, of overland communication, for civil officers visiting their native country, has diminished that necessary class of civil servants that, previously to the introduction of the overland route, existed; that is to say, the overland facilities reduce the available number of officers for the duties of the state? Very much so, no doubt.

"1279. At present there is generally a greater number absent than before the introduction of steam? Yes, I think so.

"1280. And that would naturally call for an increase of that service? Yes.

"1282. Does not the facility of coming home

encourage a greater number to come home than did come home round the Cape, having a six months' voyage staring them in the face? Yes, no doubt."

Railways were constructed, and roads and waterways were neglected, because they would not be convenient means of travelling for the British capitalists. Major General G. B. Tremenheere, in his evidence before the above Committee, on the 15th April, 1858, said:—

"Colonization cannot proceed in India as it does in Australia or Canada; it must spring from the upper, rather than the lower ranks of society, by the settlement of capitalists; that is, from the capitalist rather than from the labourer.

"The state of the existing means of travelling in India is sufficient alone to prevent the country and its resources from becoming known to capitalists. The ordinary mode of travelling is either by marching in stages from 12 to 14 miles a day, or travelling by dawk in a palanquin. Capitalists will not submit to this tardy mode of progress. I conceive that if railways existed, places holding out prospects of profitable investment would be readily visited, and capitalists would then judge for themselves of the advantages to be gained by settlement.

"I conceive that before capital can be attracted to India it is necessary to give the greatest facility for intercommunication. Both the agricultural and the mineral resources of the different localities could then be readily inquired into on the spot. Those resources would not only be accessible to capitalists but would be placed within easy communication one with the other, which is not the case now."



This witness pleaded for the construction of railways as the best means for the colonization of India. He was asked :—

“98. One portion of the inquiry which has been devolved upon this Committee by the House of Commons is the possibility of availing ourselves of the climate of the hill stations of India for colonization and settlement; have you ever turned your attention to that subject?—I think one of the most important things that could be done would be to make the hill stations accessible by railway from the plains.

He was asked by Sir Erskine Perry :—

“100. Do you mean for commercial purpose?—For commercial purposes, as well as for the purpose of settlement in the hills.”

The hills of India were suggested for colonization and the plains for settlement of Europeans in India. Thus one Mr. J. G. Waller as a witness before the above Committee was asked by Mr. Vansittart.—

“5200. You have been in the Hill Station of Darjeeling?—Yes.

“5201. What are its capabilities for English colonists and settlers?—Its capabilities are very great, and it invites colonization to such an extent, that even the labouring classes may settle there. I think the resources of the hills are boundless for the purposes of colonization. In the plains we can only have what I understand by the word Settlement.”

... ..  
“5204. In your answer to question No. 4857, you

say, "I think that the climate offers no serious impediment whatever to the settlement of Europeans;" are the Committee to understand from this that colonization is practicable in plains of Bengal?... No; I used the word 'settlement,' that I intended to cover the whole of India; Europeans may settle there, although they may not colonize; that is, you cannot introduce labourers into the plains of India; but if you have 500 Europeans settled in Bengal now, as far as climate is concerned, there is no reason why you should not have 5,000."

According to another witness, the whole of India, like Algeria, could be colonized and settled by Europeans. Mr. J. Freeman was asked:—

"1750. Do you think colonization can be effected in any part of India in the same manner and to the same extent, as Algeria has been colonised?—I think that colonization can be extended in India, but there are two kinds of colonists for India, whereas, in Algeria, there is only one kind of colonist that is absolutely necessary; one to work the land. But in India there is room for two colonists, one with capital and directing capabilities, enterprise and perseverance, using the natives for carrying out his purposes, and one a colonist to work the land himself under particular conditions and circumstances: if you encourage and render your institutions rationally fit for the higher grade of these, you will confer the greatest benefit to the country, but the latter must be always more or less limited, but they would be of great use to the country, for other reasons.

"1751. You instanced the colonization in Algeria as a proof that it may be extended in India; therefore I asked, "Do you think that it can be carried on to the

same extent in India as in Algeria? In every part I should say not, but in many parts I should say it might. In Algeria a large grant was made to a company on condition that, within a certain number of years, they should establish so many villages, and should have so much land in cultivation; and people were induced to resort there, and they have succeeded and they have introduced large permanent pasture lands by irrigation and so forth, and the cultivation of wheat and tobacco, &c., to a very great extent; and this is partly by the European labour and partly by the labour of the natives of the country; and that climate, it strikes me, is quite as warm as the climate in many parts of India; the heat is just as great, and there are the same difficulties as to the oppressiveness of the heat to be overcome there as by the Europeans in India. Then, if you come to the northern parts of India and to the hilly ranges there, I think, the climate and soil are quite fit for purposes of that kind; and if settlements were established there, to induce people to settle, it would be an advantage in having a European force at hand as in the military colonies in Algeria."

In order to make colonization possible and successful, it was necessary that a very large number of Englishmen should be brought out to India. It was with this object in view that some of the witnesses urged the necessity of appointing Englishmen in preference to Indians to all the posts of trust and responsibility. Thus to gain their end these witnesses did not scruple to paint the natives of India in the blackest color possible and say things regarding them which

were false. Major-General G. B. Tremenheere, in his evidence before the Committee on 20th April, 1858, said:—

“European settlement in India might probably be permitted by a further increase of the members of the Uncovenanted Civil Service. Their ranks are recruited from young men who, in many instances, have been brought up in India; they have small pensions, and after serving the Government for a period of years, are very likely to become good settlers. Their local experience will induce them to take advantage of opportunities for profitable investment, which in the course of their career would be surely forced upon their observation. The strength of the regular civil service is too small for a country of such vast extent. They work hard, and are a most exemplary body of men; but there is a limit to individual exertion, and they look to England as their ultimate home. A certain proportion of highly educated civilians is absolutely necessary but much of the ordinary civil business, both revenue and magisterial, might be better administered if a larger number of moderately paid officials were employed.

“340. You think that they would be brought into more immediate contact with the natives? Yes, they would become acquainted with the resources of the country, and by retiring on smaller pensions, would be more likely to settle in India than the civilians of the present day.

“341. Besides the advantages which you have already proved, what advantages do you think might arise from the training establishments in the Himalayas which you have suggested?—Besides the benefit to be derived, in a

material point of view, from establishments in the Himalayas for training Europeans in the practical sciences, other advantages would follow which might be of the greatest value to the future of India. — At present the standard of morality amongst all classes of the native community is so low, that the pure stream of English law is polluted by the corruption of the native officials, who compose the machinery of the civil courts, and are the only instruments which our civil officers can employ. Ability, a fair reputation, quickness in writing the Persian and Hindoostani languages, and an aptitude for business secure employment to a native. High moral qualities, if only based on the principles inculcated by their own religious creeds, would have influence if they could be found; but unfortunately, these native subordinates and the whole class from which they are derived are notoriously deficient in good principles, and they counteract the efforts of Government to administer strict justice to the people. The people themselves have no greater respect for truth or upright dealing; they will institute, against one another, prosecutions of the most serious character, on the most false pretences, and support them by a cloud of witnesses; even when they have a just cause for litigation, they know that if they do not possess the means to bribe freely, they cannot succeed: and [he who is able to bribe] the subordinate officers of the court, is sure to gain the day. The best way to cure this evil is to make moral worth and character, the chief qualifications for employment by the State. It is not by books, nor by teachings, that any appreciable progress will be made towards improvement of the national character of the Natives. More may be done by the living example of numbers of Englishmen, trained up among them from their infancy in the princip-



les of the Christian religion, who by reason of their moral superiority, will obtain the precedence in all public employments and in the favour of the State."

Then this witness was asked:—

"385. As a question of policy and justice, do you advocate the employment of Europeans in offices which are now filled by natives of the country in preference to the natives?—I do as a first measure, until you can obtain those qualities which, I presume, the Europeans would possess. I think the quality of the instrument should be looked to, and not the mere national character of the employed. If you could obtain natives possessing the same principle as Europeans, I would have them employed by all means, and I would give them the preference; but until you can do that, let them see that those are the qualities which are required.

"386. I presume you are of opinion that we should not govern India for our own purpose solely, but for the benefit of the inhabitants?—I conceive that the employment of high principled instruments under the Government, would be doing more justice to the people of the country than the employment of others who are corrupt, although they may be of the same nation."

It was suggested by many witnesses that Englishmen should be appointed to such posts as those of Munsifs, Sudder Ameens, Darogas, &c. Thus the above witness was questioned:—

"454. Do not you think, with regard to the salaries that the Sudder Ameens and Moonsifs draw, that we could get young men of good education and family to go out from this country to fill those situations?—No doubt, at the same time their instruction would have to begin in India, and they would require a long apprenticeship."

Then this witness was again asked :—

“474 Would it be just to exclude the native? Certainly it would not be just to exclude the native, but I would simply employ the European until you could have a native of the proper standard.

“475. Is it not something like the old adage of not allowing a boy to go into the water until he can swim, not employing the natives till they are fit for employment? If you show men what qualifications are requisite for employment, it is their fault if they do not come up to that standard; if you give them an opening, and say we will employ you if you exhibit certain qualifications, I conceive there is no hardship in keeping them out of employment till those qualifications are produced.”

Another witness before the above Committee examined on 27th April, 1858, was asked :—

“1285. Until the moral code of the Mussalman and the Hindoo is higher, are you of opinion that in the interests of India and its people they should not, unless in exceptional cases, be employed in responsible positions? Certainly, I think the creed of caste and the creed of the Mussulman is a bad creed for persons entrusted with the administration of justice; \* \*

“1286. As regards the police \* \* that respectable Europeans should fill the place of darogah, and that even in subordinate positions to those the steady intelligent European would fill the places well?—Yes,” \* \*

Mr. G. MacNair was examined before the above Committee on 6th May, 1858. He was asked :—

“2059. In what situations under Government do you think more Europeans could be employed than are employed now?—In all the public offices, such as the

Treasury, the Home and Foreign Departments, the Military, Public Works, Salt and Opium, Stamp Office, Mint, Post Office, &c ; there is at present a very large establishment of native writers in these departments ; some of them receiving from £100 to £300 per annum, and even more, who do very little work ; they are nearly all mere machines, who copy well, but cannot draught or write a letter of any consequence ; for the present pay of these native establishments I should say a much more efficient European establishment could be kept, which would be a good training school for higher appointments to get on from their own merits and exertions.

\* \* \* \*

2071. "Do not you think that depriving them of those offices would have a deteriorating effect upon their education generally, and that there would be less encouragement held out to them to educate themselves than now ?—It might be to a certain extent, but not very much,

\* \* \* \*

"2074. Do not you think it is only fair, as far as you can, to employ the natives of the country in the government of their own country ? If you could employ them beneficially, and you could put dependence upon them, it would be so, but if you cannot get trustworthy people it is not even for the benefit of their own native class to employ them. \* \* \* \*

"2092. You said that you thought the servants of the Government should be found among the European settlers ? Yes, as much as possible. I think it would be a great inducement for Europeans to go to India to qualify themselves for those appointments. \* \* \* \*

2322. Would it be just and fair towards the people

of the country to take all the employment out of their hands, and give it to the English ?—If you can not find natives fit for those employments, you must employ Europeans.

"2323. How are the native to be made fit without being employed ? You may make them fit for some of the appointments, but it is difficult to make them correct or honest without more European superintendence.

"2324 Are they likely to be made correct or honest if they are not tried ? They do not seem to improve in that respect.

\*

\*

\*

"2326. You think that it is possible to teach boys to swim without allowing them to go into the water ? No. I do not.

2327. *Chairman.* Do not you think it would be an advantage for them to see a man swim who could swim better than themselves ? Yes, I think that they would get benefit from the example."

Mr. N. B. E. Baillie was also a witness before the above Committee on 1st June, 1858. He was asked :—

"4587. Do you object to natives being appointed to high official situations ? Yes, I do ; my reasons in both cases are political. I would say that with regard to the appointment of the natives to higher situations, that I was asked the question when examined before the Committee of the House of Commons in 1853. I then said that I thought that they were improving very much. and that intellectually, I thought they might be considered qualified for higher situations. \* \* I then gave my opinion entirely as a judicial question. \* Now it is

given upon political grounds. I think, politically, the natives should not be appointed to those high situations."

The witnesses wanted the wider employment of English agency in India and yet they gave evidence of the inefficiency and incompetency of the then existing agency—that is, the members of the Covenanted Civil Service. Thus Mr. Freeman in his evidence before the above Committee, on 4th May, 1858, said :—

"If they (the Civil Servants) were only properly trained in their profession, good masters of the languages, had more intercourse with and much more real knowledge of the character and ways of dealing of the natives, I would not wish to see better men in India."

If the covenanted civilians were inefficient and did not perform their duties properly, it was preposterous to expect that uncovenanted European officers would be a better set of people. By the inefficiency and incompetency of the European employees, the natives of India would be the sufferers. Well, that did not enter into the calculation of those who advocated the more extensive employment of the Europeans in India on the score of colonization.

The improvement of land tenure to facilitate its possession by the Englishmen was also suggested. Thus Mr. J. Freeman, in his evidence before the Committee on the 29th April, 1858, was asked :—

"1654. With regard to the land, can you make any



suggestion which would improve the tenure of land and facilitate the possession of it by Europeans? Certainly; in the country where most of the land is occupied in one way or another, except in the Sunderbunds, there is a difficulty to surmount. Those gentlemen who have invested their capital in indigo and so forth, have managed it in this way; for the sake of peace and quietness they have come in as purchasers of leases for 8, 9 or 10 years, they have purchased putnee talooks or perpetual leases. Therefore when this unfortunatè sale law comes into effect upon an entire Zemindary, these are all swept away.

"1655. You wish some measure like Mr. Grant's sale law, which should give the lessee a security that his large tenures, unprotected by the sale law tenure, should not be destroyed by the sale of the Zemindary? That is one thing; our other method is to rent the land from the small tenant; \* \*"

He and several other witnesses like him were for extinguishing the rights of the ryots in Lower Bengal with a view of putting the English planter in possession of the fee-simple of the land.

One of the alleged reasons hindering the colonization of India by natives of England was their apprehension of being subjected to the jurisdiction of native Indian judges and magistrates and what they were pleased to call "Black Acts." Thus wrote the *London Times* in 1858:—

"If any thing can more clearly illustrate the sense of security in which Indian officials in spite of all warning have indulged, it is that at the very time when this alar-

ming mutiny was about to burst forth in the Bengal Presidency, it was actually proposed so to remodel the criminal jurisdiction of the country, as to subject the few Englishmen scattered over Hindostan to the anomalies of native law, to the tyrannies of native witnesses, \* \* to the ignorance of native jurymen, \* \* and to the tender mercies of native magistrates, armed with a power of summary jurisdiction, unknown even in England, and by means of which an Englishman might be confined in their vile prisons amidst all the fierce heat of India, for as much as two years."

Mr. J. P. Wise as a witness before the above Committee on the 11th May, 1858, said :—

"Suppose these Black Acts had been carried into law as was desired just previous to the breaking out of this rebellion, the scattered Europeans as a preparative measure might have been lodged in goal."

Then he was questioned by a member of the Committee,—

"2651. I think you stated that it was the object to drive the European settlers out? Yes, one would suppose so.

"2652. To whom do you impute that object; was it the effect of the laws or was it the intention of those who passed the laws? The laws would have that effect".

"2653. You do not mean to say that any Government would desire to drive settlers out?—One would suppose not, but practically that is the effect".

An attempt was made during the Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon to empower native Indian judges

and magistrates to try European criminals. But such a hue and cry was raised by "the Pucca born Britons" and the Eurasians that Lord Ripon's Government had to tamely yield to the agitators.

The government of India by the East India Company was not favourable to colonization. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the transfer of the Indian Government from the Company to the Crown was effected to give an impetus to colonization, as one of its objects. This transfer benefited the English colonists. Mr. J. Freeman in his evidence before the Committee, was asked:—

"1567. What effect do you think the transfer of the Government from the Company to the Crown will have on colonization or British settlement?—Colonization as applied to India in the present circumstances would have a very great effect I have no doubt: because the change in the form of government from the Company to the Queen leads one to expect ulterior reforms more closely connected with India itself."

Mr. G. MacNair, in his evidence before the above Committee, was asked:—

"2581. What is your opinion with reference to the interests of settlers of the present proposed change of Government from the Company to the Crown?—It would be very beneficial, and would give everyone more confidence in the government."

Mr. J. T. Mackenzie as a witness before the Committee, on 18th May, 1858, was asked:—

“3721. Do you think that the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown would or would not increase the stability of our rule in the country? Ever since I have been in India, and at home, I have constantly advocated that: it would give a great stability to our rule, India being governed in the name of the Queen; \* \*

“3722. Do you think that such a transfer would be favourable to the increased settlement of Europeans in India?—Unquestionably it would, if added to good government.”

Mr. J. G. Waller, in his evidence before the Committee on 3rd June, 1858, being questioned—

“4841. What would you enumerate among the principal objections to the settlement of Europeans in India?” said—

“I think I have enumerated several; but there is one other which is of such importance that I cannot with justice to the subject omit it. I think that the transfer of the authority of the Government from the Corporation which now represents the Crown by virtue of a trusteeship, is absolutely necessary. *If it be the real intention of the English Government to encourage the settlement of Englishmen in India, and to give full scope to private enterprise for the accomplishment of those objects connected with India, which Government alone can never effect, \* \* Englishmen, I am persuaded, and the history of the past proves it, will not accept the intervening authority of any Corporation, as a Government in lieu of the direct authority and power of the Crown, and the fundamental principles and laws of their own constitution. \* \* I think*

that the substitution of the authority and name of the Crown is essentially requisite to prepare the way for those sweeping changes in the Government of India which must follow almost immediately, not only to induce and encourage colonization, but to keep our hold over that immense extent of country."

---



## CHAPTER V.

### THE POSSIBILITY OF THE COLONIZATION OF INDIA BY THE BRITISHERS.

It should not be thought that because the Parliamentary Committee did not favour the idea of colonization, it has been given up for good by the Britishers.

Some of the obstacles to the colonization of India by the Britishers were said to be

1. The unhealthiness of the climate,
2. India not abounding in gold and silver mines.

In his work on *Asia and Europe* (p. 87) Mrs. Meredith Townsend wrote :

"This absence of white men is said to be due to climate, but even in 'the Hills' no one settles. Englishmen live on the sultry plains of New South Wales; Americans, who are only Englishmen a little dessicated, are filling up the steamy plains of Florida; Spaniards have settled as a governing caste throughout the tropical sections of the two Americas; Dutchmen dwell on in Java ; but the English, whatever the temptation, will not stay in India. No matter what the sacrifice, whether in money or dignity or pleasant occupation, an uncontrollable disgust, an overpowering sense of being

aliens inexorably divided from the people of the land, comes upon them, and they glide silently away." \* \*

Meredith Townsend's *Asia and Europe*, p. 87. \*

The real reasons for the slow colonization of India seem to us to consist in the facts that India is a large country and well-peopled and it was not a very easy task to displace the millions who inhabit it, and also in India being not rich in gold, silver and diamond mines like Peru, Mexico, California, Australia and South Africa. India is mainly an agricultural country and hence less attractive to the European goldhungerers. Major-General G. B. Tremenhare in his examination before the Parliamentary Committee on the 20th April, 1858, being asked :—

"412. \* \* Why does not he (the Englishman) go to India as well as to Australia?"

answered—

"There are more enticing objects in other countries. The finding of gold, the production of copper, and mines generally, offer much greater inducement than the slow profits derived from agricultural produce."

But now that several mines of gold and other minerals have been discovered in India, India is becoming more and more attractive to the Europeans. It is not to be wondered at if rapid colonization of India takes place now.

The promotion of Eurasians to the class of Anglo-Indians and the large amount of money

which is being spent on their education and the conversion of domiciled Europeans into "statutory natives" will also facilitate the colonization of India. The conspicuous absence of "statutory natives" and "Anglo-Indians" (or Eurasians) from the ranks of the provincial judicial services, which tax intelligence to the utmost, for, as a matter of fact, members of these services administer law and justice much better than judges belonging to the "Heavenborn Civil Service," is to be explained on no other hypothesis than their unfitness for appointment to them. And hence every attempt is made to educate them to enable them to take their place in those services.

The future belongs to the tropics. This will be evident from the following extracts from a very thoughtful article on "*The future of the Tropics*" by Dr. P. Chalmers Mitchell in the *North American Review* for 1903. He writes :

"All the phenomena of life, and among them the activities of the human race are transformations of energy. The economical system of the world hinges on the sources of energy. So far as human beings are concerned, the important sources are food and fuel..... There are two ways of meeting necessary expenditure; direct income and drawing on capital. In the case of fuel, the world possesses vast stores of capital, accumulated ages before the arrival of man.....On the other hand, the reserve of food is so small that the world may be said to live almost directly on its income.....

Considering food simply as the source of the energy of life, we may neglect water and the mineral salts as accessories, however necessary, and proteid, because that substance, in so far as it is a source of energy, raises no question that is not more simply dealt with in the case of carbohydrates. We are left then with these compounds of carbon, hydrogen and oxygen (*i.e.* carbohydrates) as the vehicles by which potential energy reaches the living organism.....Carbohydrates do not occur in seawater or in fresh-water, in rock deposits or in clays and sands; so far as our knowledge of terrestrial things goes, carbohydrate material is always associated with life.....Life in all its wonderful manifestations, in its highest and in its lowest forms, depends directly on green plants.....The explanation of this dependence is simple and universal. Green plants are the means by which there is captured for use the radiant energy dancing across the void from the sun to the earth.....From the point of view of the vital economy of the world, their (green plants') manufacture of carbohydrates is no more than a storing, as potential energy, of the radiant energy of sunlight.....Sunlight, and sunlight alone is the permanent income of the world, and the human race is living more and more closely up to its income. Precisely as the means for securing this income grow more exact, and as the world grows more directly dependent on them, the parts of the earth where the income is greatest will grow most valuable. Not for gold nor for diamonds, nor for the fat soil of volcanic slopes will be the future battle of the nations; but for that belt of the globe on which most lavishly radiant energy comes to us from the centre of our Cosmic System."

It is from such considerations as mentioned



above that men like Mr. Benjamin Kidd talk of the "control of the Tropics." Attempts are also being made to remove those pests which are responsible for the unhealthiness of the Tropics so as to make them fit for the habitation of the white man.\* Let us assume that they are successful in their attempt in inhabiting the tropical countries. But do they realise the inevitable consequence of their success? Will not the colorless people in the course of time take up pigmentation and become colored? Will not they then become as much objects of hatred and contempt as are the "colored" people now? Let them ponder over these questions when they brand colored races as inferior ones.

In his paper on "Sanitation at Panama," Dr. Gorgas wrote :—

"We hope that our success at Panama will induce other tropical countries to try the same measures ; and that thereby gradually all the tropics will be redeemed and made a suitable habitation for the white man."

Kashmir has been marked out by them for planting their colony in India. Two European travellers in Central Asia gave their evidence before the Parliamentary Committee as to the feasibility of converting the fair Vale of Kashmir into a foreign Christian colony.

---

\* See Sir Ray Lankaster's "Science from an Easy Chair," First Series, p. 5, "Tropics ideal place to live in."



Hermann Schlagintweit, Esq., Phil. Dr., LL. D., & Robert Schlagintweit, Esq., Phil. Dr., called in and examined on the 6th July 1858, were asked, and answered :

6985. What portion of the Himalaya range do you consider the most favourable for the settlement of the Europeans ?—The North-Western portion.

6986. Which should you say was the best country for the settlement or cultivation by Europeans ?—Cashmere ; but that is not part of the British possessions.

6987. But if it were, would that be the most favourable part ?—By far.

7062. What observations have you to make with regard to Cashmere ?—I should think that the political relations in Cashmere are now favourable ; Europeans can go there.....I think that the trade of Cashmere could be immensely improved ; the inhabitants of Cashmere would probably be the best to be chosen as the intermediate persons to trade with Central Asia ; they are very intelligent people, and are well acquainted with trading matters on a large scale ; they would also obtain a free passage for European goods, when going through their hands.

7063. Are the Cashmereans favourably disposed to Europeans ?—Yes, and also the Government.

In the latest edition of the *Imperial Gazetteer* of India, published in 1907, it is stated regarding Kashmir that

Economically, again, the climatic conditions of the country are important : for it is here that European colonization is to succeed, if it succeeds anywhere in India. The English race has never yet taken root in

India, but it seems possible that with more facilities for occupation Kashmere might become a white man's country. Page 16, Vol. I, Imperial Gazetteer of India. (The India Empire).

The advantages possessed by Kashmir colonization have been thus mentioned by a certain English writer :—

"Much has been written in favour of the colonization of the Himalayas by Englishmen. It is desirable, and will to a certain extent be gradually accomplished, but a vast wilderness of mountains without large valleys or table lands is not a place readily to attract extended agricultural settlement. We need a country high enough to have an English climate and flat enough to support a large population, in which we can have broad roads and a Railway and free room for all that civilization requires.

"In one of our protected states, a state of our own creation, lies the high valley of Kashmir, which has all those advantages and would make the best possible seat of European colonization in India. There is nothing to prevent the occupation of Kashmir. All the protected states are garrisoned by British troops : it alone, the most desirable, is exempted. The Raja need not be deprived of his nominal sovereignty. But it would be best, if possible, to purchase his rights, and should the price be higher than the revenues can afford, the amount would fitly be raised by loan. There we can make our Asiatic home, the centre of our power and fountain of our influence."

So it is a possibility that Kashmir some day

may become the colourless Christian peoples' colony, and the coloured heathens may be excluded from it as scrupulously as they are from the European colonies of Canada, Australia and South Africa.

---